Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current
scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 379

SELECTIVE-SERVICE CONTINUATION. Extends the Selective Training and Service Act to July 1, 1946.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF HISTORY ON S. J. RES. 159

May 9, 1946	S. J. Res. introduced by Senator Johnson. Print of the Resolution as introduced. Considered by the Senate and agreed to without amendment.
	Referred to the House Committee on Military Affairs. Print of the Resolution as referred.
May 10, 1946	House Committee reported S. J. Res. 159 without amendment. House Report 1995. Print of the measure as reported.
May 13, 1946	Debated in House and passed with amendments.
May 14, 1946	Senate agreed to House amendments.
	Approved. Public Law 379.

79TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. J. RES. 159

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 9 (legislative day, MARCH 5), 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado introduced the following joint resolution; which was read twice, considered, read the third time, and passed

JOINT RESOLUTION

To extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until July 1, 1946.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 16 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "May 15, 1946" and inserting "July 1, 1946",

79TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. J. RES. 159

JOINT RESOLUTION

To extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until July 1, 1946.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado

MAY 9 (legislative day, MARCH 5), 1946
Read twice, considered, read the third time, and passed

79TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. J. RES. 159

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 9, 1946

Referred to the Committee on Military Affairs

JOINT RESOLUTION

To extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until July 1, 1946.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 16 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "May 15, 1946" and inserting "July 1, 1946".

Passed the Senate May 9 (legislative day, March 5), 1946.

Attest: LESLIE L. BIFFLE,

Secretary.

79TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. J. RES. 159

JOINT RESOLUTION

To extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until July 1, 1946.

MAY 9, 1946

Referred to the Committee on Military Affairs

DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Legislative Reports and Service Section
(For Department staff only)

Issued May 10,1946
For actions of May 9, 1946
79th-2nd, No. 87

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....8,28,31
Corn.....22
Credit unions.....17
Dairy industry.....24
Daylight saving time.....15
Economy.....18
Expenditures.....30
Feed.....19
Fertilizers..... 5
Flood control.....10
Forestry.....20
Grains.....14,16,22
Housing.....7,26,29
Inflation.....20
Insect control.....32
Lands, grazing..... 3
Law, procedure.....23
Loans..... 1
Loans, foreign..... 1
Lend-lease.....8,9
Livestock and meat.....20
Marketing.....22
Plant diseases.....32
Price control.....20,24,26
Prices.....19
Property, surplus.....6,17
Reclamation.....12,28
Relief, foreign.....8,27
Small business.....20,26
Selective service.....4,11
Subsidies.....7,29
Sugar..... 2
Trade, foreign.....25
Transportation..... 5
Veterans.....1,11,29
Wheat.....20,21,22

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate rejected various amendments to British-loan bill, including one by Sen. Langer to limit interest on Government loans to World War II veterans to 1.6%. Senate received Secretary's letter suggesting that Congress consider continuation of Sugar Act. Senate committee submitted investigation report on grazing fees, criticizing stand of Grazing Service. Senate passed bill to continue selective service until June 15 (stop-gap measure). House agreed to special surplus-property investigation. House instructed conferees on Patman housing bill to agree to $400,000,000 for housing subsidies. House agreed to conference report on appropriation rescission bill which includes Hawaii-supplies item; agreed to transfer of $135,000,000 to UNRRA. Rep. Schwabe (Okla.) criticized wheat bonus and said Secretary's testimony on OPA extension (re black markets) indicates that Secretary does not believe OPA is a success.

SENATE

1. BRITISH LOAN. Continued debate on S. J. Res. 138, to authorize this loan (pp. 4773-843). Refused, 27-54, to sustain the point of order against constitutionality of the measure's originating in the Senate (p. 4785). Rejected, 19-59, an amendment by Sen. Knowland, Calif., to prohibit payment of the loan fund to Britain until U. S. production equals domestic consumption and the Budget has been balanced (pp. 4800-14). Rejected, 19-54, an amendment by Sen. Aiken, Vt., to limit the loan to $1,000,000,000 unless Britain eliminates trade barriers (pp. 4814-8). Rejected, 16-50, an amendment by Sen. Taft to reduce the amount of the loan to $1,250,000,000, to make it subject to an agreement by Britain to use the sum for purchases in the U. S., and to specify that such purchases are controlled under the Export Control Act (pp. 4833-9). Rejected, 12-56, an amendment by Sen. Langer, N. Dak., to limit interest to 1.6% on any Government loans to World War II veterans and to provide that no interest shall accrue for 5 years (pp. 4818-33, 4839-41). Sen. Ellender, La., submitted an amerdment to make it a condition of the British loan that 90% of the amount shall be used for purchases in the U. S. (p. 4841).

2. SUGAR-ACT CONTINUATION. Received a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture suggesting that Congress consider whether the Sugar Act of 1937 should be continued and offering to provide information with respect thereto. To Finance Committee. (p. 4785.)

3. GRAZING FEES. The Public Lands and Surveys Committee submitted a report on grazing fees, pursuant to S. Res. 139 (S. Rept. 808, pt. 2)(p. 4785). Chairman McCarran, Nev., discussed the report and criticized the policy of the Grazing Service on this matter (pp. 4785-9).

4. SELECTIVE SERVICE. Passed S. J. Res. 159, to continue the Selective Training and Service Act, with an amendment by Sen. Gurney, S. Dak., to make June 15, 1946, the termination date (pp. 4799-800). It is understood that this is a stop-gap measure to keep the Act from expiring during consideration of the British loan.

5. FERTILIZER; TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Maybank, S. C., inserted several telegrams criticizing the ODT embargo on transportation of nitrate of soda (p. 4790).

HOUSE.

6. SURPLUS PROPERTY. Agreed without amendment to H. Res. 385, to direct a special investigation of surplus-property disposal (p. 4845).

7. HOUSING SUBSIDIES. Agreed, 187-158, to a motion by Chairman Spence of the Banking and Currency Committee to instruct the House conferees on H. R. 4761, the Patman Housing bill, to agree to $400,000,000 (in lieu of the Senate amendment providing for $600,000,000) for housing subsidies (pp. 4845-60).

8. SECOND SURPLUS APPROPRIATION RESCISSION BILL. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 5604 (pp. 4862-3). For provisions of the report see Digest 81. Concurred in the Senate amendment regarding Army-Navy lend-lease, with an amendment to transfer $135,000,000 to UNRRA (p. 4872).

9. LEND-LEASE. Received from the President a proposed provision continuing defense-aid appropriations for obligation during 1947 to cover liquidation expenses (H. Doc. 568). To Appropriations Committee. (p. 4876.)

10. FLOOD CONTROL. Received from the War Department a survey report on North Canadian River (Okla. and Tex.) and Beaver River (Okla.). To Flood Control Committee. (H. Doc. 572.) (p. 4876.)

11. SELECTIVE SERVICE; VETERANS. The Military Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 4051, to grant to enlisted personnel of the armed forces certain benefits in lieu of accumulated leave (H. Rept. 1990)(p. 4876).

12. WATER COMPACT. The Irrigation and Reclamation Committee reported with amendment H. R. 4701, authorizing Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming to enter into a compact for division of the waters of Bear River and its tributaries (H. Rept. 1994)(p. 4876).

SENATE - May 8

13. SURPLUS PROPERTY. Received from the President supplemental appropriation estimates of $7,000,000 to enable the State Department to carry out its functions and responsibilities with respect to surplus property disposal abroad (S. Doc. 180). To Appropriations Committee.

BILLS INTRODUCED

14. GRAIN. H.R. 6390, by Rep. Robertson, N.Dak., to provide for the payment of a bonus of 45 cents per bushel for all wheat, 55 cents per bushel for all corn, and 5 cents per bushel for oats purchased and sold between January 1, 1945, and April 18, 1946, and providing for payment of additional bonuses if paid by the United States Government. To Agriculture Committee (p. 4876.)

15. DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME. H.R. 6391, by Rep. McMillan, S.Car., to provide daylight saving in the District of Columbia. To District of Columbia Committee. (p. 4876.)

So I am going to make the suggestion that when the labor bill comes up there will be Senators who cannot lend their assent to such hasty and angry consideration of it as is obviously likely to be given it if we attempt to act upon it in the passion of this particular moment.

Mr. President, I do not approve of what John L. Lewis is doing any more than anyone else does. Yet it is an incident of the complicated machinery of our modern economic life. It is like the stopping of one valve in a vast machine, which makes the whole machine stop. So long as we have a provision in the Federal Constitution which says that except as a punishment for crime no citizen can be condemned to involuntary servitude, I do not know exactly, as the able leader has better said, what we can do tomorrow or the day after, that will put these men back into the mines. It is a complicated question. It goes to the very root of our economy. Some Senators who are liberals in saying that we must not interfere with the freedom of the individuals in certain matters, and who claim that we who want to pass certain legislation are totalitarian, when it comes to the subject of labor are all too ready to forsake their definition of liberalism and to become totalitarian themselves, if the people who are the victims of their totalitarianism happen to be the working men and women of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, two Senators are now on their feet ready to offer a resolution to extend the draft for 30 days, or up to July 1. It will, of course, be in such form that the Senate can pass upon it. The Senate can by unanimous consent agree to act upon it without referring it to a committee. Would the Senator from Mississippi be willing to withdraw his motion so that we may proceed with the pending business with the understanding that we will take up the 30-day extension, or such other extension as the Senate is willing to act upon, with the understanding that immediately upon the conclusion of both matters the Senate will take up the labor legislation? And if necessary I shall move to take it up.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I should like to have a unanimous consent agreement, which I think we could obtain, to vote on this legislation and all amendments thereto some time today, I do not care how late it may be. As for the resolution extending the draft 30 or 60 days, if it could be speedily adopted of course I would be content. But if it should lead to protracted debate I would not care to enter into such an agreement as the Senator from Kentucky has just proposed.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator may renew his motion at any time during the day.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator asked me to agree to dispose of two other measures before proceeding with the motion to take up the Case bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that would be a reasonable agreement to enter into. I think the Senator would get action.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the Senator will fix a time to vote on the unfinished business——

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot fix it. If the Senator will permit me, I will feel around and see what I can get in the way of a unanimous consent agreement. Let me propound a request.

I ask unanimous consent that not later than 7 o'clock p. m. today the Senate proceed to vote on the pending joint resolution and all amendments thereto without further debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. LANGER. I object.

Mr. TAFT. I object.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that at an hour not later than 9 o'clock p. m. today the Senate proceed to vote on the pending joint resolution and all amendments thereto.

Mr. LANGER. I object.

Mr. TAFT. I object, for the reason that I do not like to set a definite hour for voting. I have an amendment, the last amendment to be presented, and I should like to take 10 or 15 minutes to present it. Under such an arrangement the last amendment is always shut out.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that during the remainder of the consideration of the pending joint resolution no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 15 minutes on the joint resolution or any amendment thereto.

Mr. LANGER. I object.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. BARKLEY. Objection has already been made.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may I make a suggestion to the majority leader?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Could we not agree, by unanimous consent, that the Senate shall remain in continuous session until the pending joint resolution and all amendments thereto are disposed of? That would not tie us down to a certain hour.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not customary to agree by unanimous consent to stay in session indefinitely.

Mr. KNOWLAND. However, I believe that the situation we are getting into is sufficiently important, and the succeeding legislation is sufficiently important, for the Senate to go without a little sleep for a short time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator; but I wish to say to the Senate, reiterating my suggestion made earlier today, that when I asked the Senate to remain in session until we finish consideration of the joint resolution, no objection was raised to that program. So far as I am concerned, and so far as I can control the situation—which is very little, sometimes—the Senate will remain in session until we conclude consideration of the British loan. I will then facilitate, so far as I can, the immediate passage of a joint resolution extending the draft for 30 days, or for such other time as the Senate may see fit to extend it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Would it not be possible to set aside the unfinished business and pass a joint resolution extending the draft for 30 days, so as to get it out of the way? Then, it seems to me, Senators pressing for legislation would know what to expect.

Mr. BARKLEY. It must be done by unanimous consent; and if any Senator objects to extending the draft for even 30 days, he would object to that arrangement.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. I ask unanimous consent that the motion made by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] be temporarily withdrawn, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a joint resolution extending the draft for 30 days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. I object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to introduce a joint resolution, to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until July 1, 1946. The joint resolution reads as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 16 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "May 15, 1946" and inserting "July 1, 1946."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 159) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until July 1, 1946, was received, and read twice by its title.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I correctly understand the Senator's joint resolution, it would extend the draft until July 1.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct; and the virtue in that plan, instead of a 30-day extension, is that all the statistics pertaining to this subject extend to the end of the month, and it is difficult to tell what is going to happen in the middle of the month. A 30-day extension would extend the draft only to June 15.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending motion, and everything else before the Senate, be temporarily laid aside, without prejudice, and that the Senate proceed to consider the joint resolution just introduced by the Senator from Colorado, without reference to the joint resolution to a committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 159) introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until July 1, 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I move to amend the joint resolution offered by the Senator from Colorado by changing the date from July 1, 1946, to June 15, 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, of course, this may seem to be a very petty matter. It involves only the difference between 6 weeks and 4 weeks. But there is considerable history back of it. Many months ago I introduced a resolution in the Senate Committee on Military Affairs to do this very thing, and the Senate Committee on Military Affairs acted favorably on my resolution.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall be very glad to yield in a moment.

Mr. GURNEY. Will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of withdrawing my amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROPOSED LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

The Senate resumed consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 138) to implement further the purpose of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out an agreement with the United Kingdom, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TOBEY. What is the parliamentary situation with reference to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been temporarily laid aside.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to reiterate the announcement which I have heretofore made, that it is my purpose, so far as I can control the situation, to keep the Senate in session today until it acts upon the British loan. I assure the Senator from Mississippi that if he will withdraw his motion to set aside the unfinished business and take up the labor legislation, immediately upon the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution I myself, if necessary—if I must say that in order to indicate my good faith—will move to take up the labor legislation and proceed with it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it the purpose, at the conclusion of action on the labor legislation, to return immediately to consideration of the extension of the Selective Service Act?

Mr. BARKLEY. I should say "Yes," subject to the possibility that if by that time the OPA legislation is ready for consideration, we might take it up. I doubt very much if it will be ready. I think it is reasonable to say that the OPA legislation will not be ready for consideration before week after next.

Mr. AIKEN. Until the draft legislation is taken care of, no 18-year-old boy in this country who has any idea of going to college this fall will know whether he can go or not. Enrollment in the colleges is now in progress, and the boys are having difficulty getting into the colleges.

Mr. BARKLEY. As a result of the joint resolution which the Senate has just passed, both the OPA and the draft will expire at the same time, so we shall have to consider both questions before the 1st of next July.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, with the understanding announced by the Senator from Kentucky, I withdraw my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk three amendments and ask that they lie on the table and be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from California, which takes precedence over the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the joint resolution it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 3. No payment shall be made to the United Kingdom under the agreement or under this joint resolution until after (1) the date of a proclamation by the President, or the date specified in a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of Congress, declaring that the general level of production in the United States equals or exceeds domestic consumption, and (2) the current annual budget of the United States has reached the point where the Federal receipts exceed expenditures; and such payments shall be made only to the extent that total receipts subsequent to the date of enactment of this act up to the time when such payment is proposed to be made exceed the total expenditures for the same period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL AVIATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it is my intention to introduce a bill which I believe to be of considerable importance. Since it has a bearing on certain other proposed legislation which already is before the Senate, I desire to make some explanation at this time.

In brief, the bill is for the purpose of establishing a Department of Civil Aviation, to which will be transferred all the functions of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics itself. It is expected that such a new Department for Civil Aviation will eventually include certain other activities of the Executive Department which now are minor, but which probably will grow as civil aviation grows.

One of the purposes is to relieve the pressure upon the State Department for growth into the field of civil aviation, such as the project for setting up a new Assistant Secretary of State for Air. Of course, Mr. President, the State Department must retain all cognizance over foreign relations which evolve from the use of air, but much necessary assistance in that line can best come from the new Department.

A little later I shall go somewhat more into detail as to the purposes of the new Department which I propose. However, Mr. President, first I should like to make a brief statement regarding the various projects for establishing some form of an executive department for military aviation.

There is, of course, a relationship between civil aviation and that intended for war purposes. Those relationships have changed within recent years, and in the future they are bound to be very different from those we have previously known.

The idea of separating the air components from the War and Navy Departments has been before the country for a long time. An air force thus fully separated from the land and sea forces of the Nation is an idea which was transplanted from England some 25 years ago. It was based on the British Royal Air Force. Since then, the agitation for such separation of the air arm from our own ground and sea forces has been rather continuous and has resulted in a certain number of inquiries and authoritative reports on the subject.

Beginning in 1919 and extending over 20 years, there has been a series of hearings and reports, by committees and commissions variously composed, which have passed upon the subject. During the early years of that period, the subject was twice before committees of Congress, but without acceptance of a plan for a separate air department. In 1925 there was a very thorough investigation by a carefully chosen board which we now know as the Morrow Board. It did not recommend a separate air department. The next authoritative and balanced inquiry was also made by a presidential board, which was appointed in 1935. It did not recommend a separation of air components from the Army or Navy.

In all, there have been 26 of these studies on what had been the main question of placing air organizations of the armed services in a separate department. Some of the studies, particularly those just mentioned, were at very high levels. A few were more restricted—both in scope and in the composition of the committees. In all the 26 instances there were only 4 in which a separate air department was endorsed.

CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Legislative Reports and Service Section
(For Department staff only)

Issued May 13, 1946
For actions of May 10, 1946
79th-2nd, No. 88

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....7,12
Appropriations.....8,21
Clothing.....18
Congressional reorganization. 3
Cotton.....24
Education..... 1
Electrification.....17,21
Fisheries.....30
Food supply.....5,20
Forestry.....9
Grains.....20
Health.....27
Housing.....9,15,21,25
Income, farm.....19
Labor.....2,4
Lands, grazing..... 8
Lands, public.....33
Livestock and meat.....20
Loans, foreign..... 1
Minerals.....13
Personnel.....6,32
Postage rates.....28
Price control.....14,22
Prices.....23
Property, surplus..... 4
Relief, foreign.....16,20
Research.....34
Roads.....1,9
Selective service.....11
Small business.....26
Social security.....29
Subsidies.....9,15,23
Sugar.....14
Taxation.....19
Trade, foreign.....10
Transportation.....35
Veterans.....21
Wheat.....19
Wildlife.....31

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed British-loan bill. Senate began debate on labor-disputes bill. Senate agreed to special committee with power to report LaFollette-Monroney Committee proposals regarding Congressional reorganization. Sen. Wiley said coal strike endangers food canning by causing metal-can shortage. House debated Interior appropriation bill; rejected amendment to restore Grazing service to Budget estimate. House received conference report on Patman housing bill; authorizes $400,000,000 for subsidies and $15,000,000 for access roads to forests. House passed bill to continue Export Control Act for 1 year; ready for President. House debated stop-gap selective-service bill.

SENATE

1. BRITISH LOAN. Passed, 46-34, with amendments S. J. Res. 138, to authorize the loan to Britain (pp. 4881-902). Rejected the following amendments: By Sen. Ellender, La., to require Britain to spend 90% of the loan in the U. S.; by a 29-52 vote (pp. 4882-98). By Sen. Johnson, Colo., to finance $2,750,000,000 of loan by Treasury bonds and $1,000,000,000 through RFC; by a 26-55 vote (pp. 4998-9). By Sen. Langer, N. Dak., to provide $3,750,000,000 for public roads (p. 4899). By Sen. Langer, to authorize funds for Federal aid to education (pp. 4899-901).

2. LABOR DISPUTES. Began debate on H. R. 4908, to provide additional facilities for mediation of labor disputes, by a 66-9 vote (pp. 4902-5, 4907-17).

3. CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION. Agreed as reported to S. Res. 260, to provide for a special committee to consider and report legislation to carry out the LaFollette-Monroney Committee recommendations (pp. 4905-6).

4. SURPLUS PROPERTY. Sen. Morse, Oreg., asked for an investigation of surplus-property disposal under the War Assets Administration (pp. 4917-8).

5. LABOR DISPUTES; CANNING INDUSTRY. Sen. Wiley, Wis., stated that the coal strike is endangering the preservation of farm crops because it causes insufficient metal cans (pp. 4881-2).

6. EMPLOYEE DETAILS. The Public Lands and Surveys Committee reported the detail to the Committee of two Forest Service employees (p. 4880).

7. RECESSED until Mon., May 13 (p. 4919).

HOUSE

8. INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL. Continued debate on this bill, H. R. 6335 (pp. 4927-70). Rejected an amendment by Rep. Robinson of Utah to restore the Budget estimate for Grazing Service (pp. 4933-40). There was also discussion of soil conservation, electrification, wildlife conservation, reclamation, etc.

9. HOUSING. Received the conference report on H. R. 4761, the Patman housing bill (pp. 4923-6). The conference report fixes the termination date at Dec. 31, 1947; authorizes $400,000,000 for subsidies, provides that $15,000,000 authorized for premium payments may be made available for construction of access roads to standing timber on Government lands, and provides for market guarantees on new-type housing.

10. EXPORT CONTROL. Passed without amendment S. 1980, to continue the Export Control Act until June 30, 1947, which was reported earlier in the day by the Military Affairs Committee (H. Rept. 2003)(pp. 4977, 4972). This bill will now be sent to the President.

11. SELECTIVE SERVICE. Discussed S. J. Res. 159, to continue the Selective Training and Service Act until July 1, 1946, which had been reported by the Military Affairs Committee earlier in the day without amendment (H. Rept. 1995)(pp. 4977, 4921-3).

12. ADJOURNED until Mon., May 13 (p. 4977). Legislative program as announced by the majority leader: Mon., D. C. bills, Interior appropriation bill, selective-service extension; Tues., Gwynne bill on statute of limitations; Wed., Coast Guard appropriation; Thurs., legislative appropriation bill; conference reports when opportunity presents itself (p. 4934).

BILL INTRODUCED

13. MINERAL LANDS. H.R. 6410, by Rep. Stigler, Okla., authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to lease the interest of the U.S. in minerals in or under certain real property located in Muskogee County, Okla. To Agriculture Committee. (p. 4978.)

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

14. SUGAR; PRICE CONTROL. Rep. Plumley, Vt., inserted a Bridgeport (Conn.) Post editorial criticizing price ceilings on maple sugar and sirup (p. A2741).

15. HOUSING. Speech in the House by Rep. Darden, N.C., opposing subsidies on housing (pp. A2741-2).

16. FOREIGN RELIEF. Rep. Lynch, N.Y., inserted Cardinal Spellman's letter appealing for aid for the starving people of Europe (pp. A2744-5).

17. ELECTRIFICATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Earthman, Tenn., commending the accomplishments of the TVA and REA in providing electric power in the Tennessee Valley (p. A2746).

18. CLOTHING. Rep. Thom, Ohio, inserted a N.Y. clothing firm's statement comparing the U.S. clothing shortage with the more severe shortage in England (p. A2748).

19. FARM INCOME; TAXATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Robertson, N.Dak., criticizing the proposed regulation to tax wheat-certificate income as 1947 farm

collar worker, the laborer, and all of those who want to keep America American.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a short editorial.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts.

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a talk which he delivered last night over the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Mr. TARVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made last night by the Honorable DWIGHT L. ROGERS, of Florida, over radio station WWDC on the subject of terminal leave pay.

Mr. THOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the Browning, King Co., of New York City, on the clothing supply in England.

PREVENTION OF INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up for consideration at this time the bill (H. R. 5114) to prevent interference with interstate or foreign commerce and to prevent interference with public utilities serving communities engaged in interstate and foreign commerce, which has to do with the settlement of strikes so far as public utilities are concerned.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CONCESSIONS MADE BY CERTAIN DETROIT UNIONS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members of the House to a concession made by some of the teamsters unions of Detroit. They have conceded that they will soften their demands made of the small businessman, the independent ice dealers and the retail merchants. They have finally concluded they will not ask the employers to pay $5 a month and join the union. Perhaps the reason is that it is going to be difficult to get collective bargaining when employer and employe belong to the same union. I do not know how that would work out under the Wagner law. How can a group bargain when all are members of the same union under the NLRA which provides for collective bargaining; employers cannot join a union.

I notice the majority leader is present. I would like to have him look up those amendments to the Wagner law I offered first in 1939 and again in January of this year and get out a rule for House action on them. The administration has been stalling since January of '37.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table today and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE EFFECT OF THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, what happens when the country runs out of coal?

In the State of Illinois there are 35 cities in which 25 percent of all the industrial employees are out of work. There are another 30 cities where 63½ percent of the industrial employees are out of work.

In 44 cities 110,000 men are working on a 24-hour-a-week basis. Sixty-seven thousand are completely unemployed. In the city of Peoria, out of 36,000 industrial workers, 14,000 are out entirely, and 22,000 are on a 24-hour-a-week basis. Out of 7,000 retail employees, 4,200 are on a 24-hour-a-week basis.

That is the result of a paralyzing Nation-wide coal strike. I trust another body may this day get busy and take up where we left off 90 days ago, on the 7th of February 1946.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF DRAFT ACT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 159, to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to July 1, 1946.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] who has left the Chamber for a moment, I object.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that for a minute?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Until I make an explanation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Would the gentleman withhold that until the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] returns in about 5 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, that is satisfactory to me if it is agreeable to the Speaker. The gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is a member of the committee, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS], also a member of the committee, are both here.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was odered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 112]

Adams	Gearhart	Patrick
Allen, Ill.	Geelan	Patterson
Anderson, Calif.	Gillie	Peterson, Fla.
Baldwin, Md.	Grant, Ala.	Phillips
Baldwin, N. Y.	Grant, Ind.	Price, Fla.
Barrett, Pa.	Griffiths	Rains
Barry	Hale	Rayfiel
Bell	Harless, Ariz.	Reece, Tenn.
Bender	Harness, Ind.	Rizley
Biemiller	Hart	Rodgers, Pa.
Bland	Hébert	Roe, N. Y.
Bonner	Hendricks	Russell
Bradley, Mich.	Herter	Sadowski
Buckley	Hinshaw	Sasscer
Butler	Hoch	Sheppard
Cannon, Fla.	Jarman	Sikes
Carlson	Johnson, Ind.	Somers, N. Y.
Celler	Kee	Stevenson
Cochran	Keogh	Stewart
Coffee	Kilday	Sumners, Tex.
Cole, Kans.	Kirwan	Thomas, Tex.
Combs	LaFollette	Tolan
Cooley	Landis	Torrens
Courtney	Lane	Vinson
Curley	Lea	Voorhis, Calif.
Daughton, Va.	McCowen	Wasielewski
Dawson	McKenzie	Weichel
Dingell	Madden	West
Drewry	Maloney	White
Durham	Mansfield, Tex.	Whitten
Eaton	Merrow	Whittington
Elsaesser	Miller, Calif.	Wilson
Engle, Calif.	Monroney	Wolcott
Fuller	Morgan	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gardner	Morrison	
Gavin	Norton	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 324 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF DRAFT ACT

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] has asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 159, to extent the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until July 1, 1946. Is there objection?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that for a minute?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Speaker, I withhold it for a minute.

Mr. MAY. I would like to make a very brief statement for the information of the House. This joint resolution will continue in effect the Selective Service Act until the first day of July. The situation in another body is such that it was not able to take up the act that we passed and sent over there. The bill as written contains a provision which au-

thorizes the President of the United States to seize plants in time of war. Everybody undoubtedly knows the serious situation that prevails throughout the country at this time in one of our basic industries. If the act is permitted to expire he will lose the authority that is given under the military statute. I hope there will be no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERIDAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs if the report we read in the press, and that is the only information available to the Members of the House regarding this Senate resolution, stating that one of the reasons for the passage of this resolution is to give the President authority in the coal strike, is correct?

Mr. MAY. The reason for passing the resolution, and the thing it does, is to extend the Selective Service Act which contains a provision that does authorize the President under certain circumstances to seize a plant. The chief objective however is to continue the selection of men for our armed forces.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I want to make the observation, Mr. Speaker, that it is altogether inconsistent, it is a bit cowardly on the part of the Congress to extend the draft law and say to the mothers of this country that because some one proposes a strike we have to take their boys into the military service.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman from Pennsylvania knows that no one on this floor has been more determined in his efforts than I to protect the 18- and 19-year-old boys; but the situation is such that this is merely a temporary stop-gap to enable the legislation to be considered in another body.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. It is also tying up the future of these boys with the threat of a coal strike. There is no justification for penalizing the youth of our Nation because of industrial conditions.

Mr. MAY. It is tying that up, yes; unless I can get the other body to take up and dispose of the pending legislation there in which we can write the necessary provisions that will protect the very thing the gentleman wants protected.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERIDAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the reemployment rights of veterans are also involved, and they will lapse unless some stop-gap resolution is passed.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Speaker, that is a Senate obligation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is very apparent that quick action is necessary. I recognize that many Members probably will want time to discuss this important question. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order on Monday next to consider the resolution, and that general debate be allowed for either 1 or 2 hours, to be controlled one-half by the chairman of the committee, and one-half by the ranking minority member. The purpose of that would be to obviate the necessity of applying for a rule because of the urgency of the situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman spoke about 1 hour for debate on this important question. Is that the limit of debate?

Mr. McCORMACK. I said 1 or 2 hours. I will make it 2 hours so that it will be specific. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue for a period of 2 hours, to be controlled as provided for under the rules of the House.

Mr. SHORT. I think that is fair and generous, and there should be no objection to it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts why it is necessary to tie these two propositions together? If you want the President to have the authority to seize these plants, why do you not bring in a resolution specifically providing for that?

Mr. McCORMACK. Frankly, answering the gentleman's question, I do not consider they are both tied together. We have a practical situation where the present selective-service law expires on May 15, and so far as I am concerned, this is to meet the main question on the extension of it pending consideration of legislation in the other branch. Legislation has already passed this body. I do not consider the power to seize mines, for example, the primary question. The question is involved, but I do not consider it the primary question. My unanimous-consent request simply means this: It obviates and settles the matter for Monday so that Members will know, and without the necessity of it going to the Committee on Rules this afternoon. I am requesting 2 hours of general debate, and it comes up under the regular rules of the House.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I do not intend to delay any action that the House wishes to take on this matter, do not misunderstand me, but I do not think that the proposition the gentleman is putting up here is quite what it ought to be.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I would like to inquire of the majority leader, if his unanimous consent request prevails, will we be given opportunity on Monday to amend the resolution?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. This is under the general rules of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this in no way would change the parliamentary situation. The bill would come up on Monday just as if it had come up under a rule. All we do is eliminate the necessity of having a meeting of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The House passed a bill which made a change in the date of May 15. If we extend the time by this resolution to July 1, would that necessitate the House's going back and taking up its bill and making some change in the date in that bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. The bill we passed is pending in the other branch, and it remains there for consideration.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman does not feel that the passing of this resolution would nullify anything the House did?

Mr. McCORMACK. It would not nullify the passage of the bill, but, to be perfectly frank, naturally, if the resolution passes, it means that whatever action is taken by the other branch and ultimately by this branch will be affected by the passage of this resolution, as far as the date is concerned.

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to object because I agree with the suggestion made by the minority leader that this simply expedites the consideration of this very important matter on next Monday, what disturbs me is this, and I should like to get the gentleman's reaction. In the papers this morning General Devers is quoted as saying publicly in an address he made that the Members of Congress are cowards for failing to deal with the matter of draft extension. As one Member of Congress, I resent that sort of talk and that sort of accusation against the Congress of the United States. We did deal with it here in the House of Representatives. I am just wondering what the gentleman from Massachusetts thinks about that sort of a characterization of the Members of the Congress, who are seeking to do the best they can to discharge their responsibilities?

Mr. McCORMACK. The inquiry of the gentleman is irrelevant to the unanimous-consent request submitted, but in answer to his inquiry, I would naturally say that General Devers is entitled to his own opinion, but that my personal views contrast sharply with his. Of course, I recognize there might be some limitation upon the prudence of a general in the Army in regard to making statements, but I am not going to get into that now because I am trying to get the consideration of this resolution made in order on Monday.

Mr. HALLECK. I am perfectly willing to go along with that. It seems to me the fact that the gentleman is getting it ready for consideration on Monday is indicative of the fact that there has been no such lack of courage as the general is charging against the Congress of the United States. I resent the charge.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for information? I just want to get some information.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman can reserve the right to object.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thought maybe the gentleman would yield to me.

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly I will yield, if I have the right to do so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the other body should pass the Hobbs bill and it should be put into effect, would not that dispose of Lewis' request for the 10-cent royalty? Would it not make that demand illegal?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to answer that question.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order has been demanded.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Rhode Island has demanded the regular order.

Mr. FORAND. I will withhold that for a moment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, we are concerned about the draft matter and also about this coal-strike matter. I regret that they are tied together. May I ask the gentleman, just for my own information and for the benefit of the House, under the General War Powers Act, does not the President have the power to seize any plant in this country?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to answer that question. To me, the primary question is the extension of the Selective Service Act, and, as far as I am concerned, other questions that are involved therein are incidental thereto. My request asks for nothing except to obviate the necessity of going to the Rules Committee today. Everything else is the same as if a rule were reported out.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But the President undoubtedly has the power in the General War Powers Act to seize any plant in this country.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no knowledge of that, and I cannot confirm or contradict it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. He has the power under the Second War Powers Act.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not challenging the statement of the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think we are laboring under a little misapprehension about there being two questions involved. I do not think the question of seizure is affected by this resolution to extend the life of the Draft Act. I call the attention of the House to the fact that the War Labor Disputes Act, in which the power to seize exists, has a separate termination date. I want to read it for the information of the House. It is true that the War Labor Disputes Act has a section which amends one section of the Draft Act giving this power of seizure. But in the War Labor Disputes Act there is a separate termination clause, which reads as follows:

Except as to offenses committed prior to such date, the provisions of this act and the amendments made by this act shall cease to be effective at the end of 6 months following the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President or upon the date * * * of the passage of a concurrent resolution of the two Houses.

It seems to me that removes this whole question about whether this resolution extending the Draft Act has anything to do with the seizure of coal mines.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Then the gentleman's opinion is, if there is a desire to seize the mines, the power does exist whether or not the Draft Act expires?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Absolutely. I do not think it is affected one way or another.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. In that event, there is no need for the passage of this resolution so far as that purpose is concerned.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is another question.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The gentleman does not contend that the unemployment rights of veterans are not involved and that if this is not passed they will lapse automatically and that the veterans will have no unemployment rights under the law?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I did not intend to express any view in opposition to this resolution. On the contrary I favor the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, might I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished majority leader, in connection with his request for 2 hours general debate, after that will the resolution be subject to debate under the 5-minute rule?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. And it will be subject to amendment?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House in conference on the bill H. R. 4761, entitled "An act to amend the National Housing Act by adding thereto a new title relating to the prevention of speculation and excessive profits in the sale of housing, and to insure the availability of real estate for huosing purposes at fair and reasonable prices, and for other purposes," may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4761) to amend the National Housing Act by adding thereto a new title relating to the prevention of speculation and excessive profits in the sale of housing, and to insure the availability of real estate for housing purposes at fair and reasonable prices, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946'.

"SEC. 1. (a) The long-term housing shortage and the war have combined to create an unprecedented emergency shortage of housing, particularly for veterans of World War II and their families. This requires during the next two years a house-construction program larger than ever before. The first step toward such a program is to overcome the serious shortages and bottlenecks with respect to building materials, to expedite the production of such materials, to allocate them for house construction and other essential purposes, and to accelerate the production of houses with preferences for veterans of World War II and at sales prices or rentals within their means. To carry out this program, it is necessary to invest a housing expediter with adequate powers including the power to issue policy directives. Accomplishment of these objectives will assist returning veterans to acquire housing at fair prices, stimulate industry and employment, prevent a post-emergency collapse of values in the housing field, and promote a swift and orderly transition to a peacetime economy.

"(b) The provisions of this Act, and all regulations and orders issued thereunder, shall terminate on December 31, 1947, or upon the date specified in a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress, declaring that the provisions of the Act are no longer necessary to deal with the existing national emergency, whichever date is the earlier.

"(c) The provisions of this Act shall be applicable to the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby created an office to be known as Housing Expediter; and the President is authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint an existing official of the Government to serve as Housing Expediter, or to appoint the Housing Expediter either within any existing agency or as an independent officer of the Government. In the event of an appointment of an existing official, he is hereby authorized and permitted to continue in his present post while serving as Housing Expediter, except that he shall receive no additional compensation by reason of his appointment hereunder. If, however, such Housing Expediter is appointed within an existing agency of the Government, he shall receive compensation in compliance with the laws and regulations applicable to officers within such agency; if the Housing Expediter is appointed as an independent officer of the Government, he shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum.

"(b) The Housing Expediter, in addition to such other functions and powers as may be delegated to him by the President, is authorized to—

"(1) formulate such plans and programs as are necessary to provide for an increased supply of housing accommodations of all kinds and, in particular, of homes available for sale or rental at moderate prices to veterans of World War II and their immediate families;

"(2) issue such orders, regulations, or directives to other executive agencies (including the Office of Economic Stabilization and the Office of Price Administration) as may be necessary to provide for the exercise of their powers in a manner required by or con-

sistent with the execution of the aforesaid plans and programs, and to coordinate the activities of such agencies directed to the execution of such plans and programs. Each executive agency shall carry out without delay the orders, regulations, or directives of the Housing Expediter, and shall, to the extent necessary, modify its operations and procedures from time to time to conform to the directions of the Housing Expediter;

"(3) recommend to the President the enactment of such legislation as may be necessary to provide the authority to carry out such plans and programs as are not authorized under existing law;

"(4) consult and cooperate with other agencies of the Federal Government, State and local governments, industries, labor, and other groups, both national and local, with respect to the problems created by the housing emergency and the steps which can be taken to remedy it.

"(c) The executive agencies of the Government shall exercise their emergency powers and other powers for the purpose of aiding in the solution of the problems created by the existing housing emergency, the alleviation of which is vital to an orderly transition from war to peace.

"(d) (1) All functions, powers, authority, or duties vested in the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion or the Director thereof by the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 which are or may be necessary or suitable to enable the Housing Expediter to carry out the provisions of this Act and such plans and programs as such Housing Expediter may develop for the alleviation of the housing emergency, are hereby transferred to the Housing Expediter. The powers so transferred shall include the power to issue orders, regulations, or directives to other executive agencies with respect to the exercise by such agencies of their respective powers and authority.

"(2) The powers so transferred shall continue during the period in which this Act is in effect, notwithstanding any other provision terminating such powers contained in the said War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944.

"SEC. 3. (a) Whenever in the judgment of the Expediter the sales prices of housing accommodations the construction of which is completed after the effective date of this Act have risen or threaten to rise to an extent or in a manner inconsistent with the purposes of this Act, he may by regulation or order establish maximum sales prices for such housing accommodations in accordance with the provisions of this Act. Any such regulation or order may be limited in its scope to such geographical area or areas and to such types or classifications of such housing accommodations as in the judgment of the Expediter may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Act. Before issuing any regulation or order under this section, the Expediter shall, so far as practicable, advise and consult with representative members of industries affected by such regulation or order, and he shall give consideration to their recommendations and to any recommendations which may be made by State and local officials concerned with housing conditions in any area affected by such regulation or order.

"(b) Any regulation or order issued under the authority of this section with respect to housing accommodations the construction of which is completed after the effective date of this Act shall provide that no sale of any such housing accommodations shall take place until after the builder thereof has filed with the appropriate agency designated by the Expediter a description of such accommodations, including a statement of the proposed maximum sales price, and has received from such agency a certification that such price is reasonably related to the value of the accommodations to be sold, taking into consideration (1) reasonable construction costs not in excess of the legal maximum prices of the materials and services required for the construction, (2) the fair market value of the land (immediately prior to construction) and improvements sold with the housing accommodations, and (3) a margin of profit reflecting the generally prevailing profit margin upon comparable units during the calendar year 1941. Any prospective seller of such housing accommodations may apply for such certification at any time, including before the commencement of construction, during its progress, or after its completion. In any case where a certification of approval of a proposed maximum sales price has been issued prior to the completion of construction, the prospective seller may, at any time before the first sale, apply for such revision of the maximum sales price previously certified as may be justified by a showing of special circumstances arising during the course of construction and not reasonably to have been anticipated at the time of the issuance of the earlier certification. The first sale of housing accommodations the construction of which is completed after the effective date of this Act shall not be made at a price in excess of the maximum sales price certified under this subsection. The actual price at which any such housing accommodations is first sold, plus any increases authorized pursuant to subsection (c), shall be the maximum sales price for any subsequent sale of such housing accommodations.

"(c) The Expediter shall by regulation or order provide for appropriate price increases for major structural changes or improvements, not including ordinary maintenance and repair, effected subsequent to the first sale after the effective date of this Act.

"(d) The Expediter may promulgate such regulations as he deems necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this Act and may exercise any power or authority conferred upon him by this Act through such department, agency, or officer as he shall direct. Any regulation or order under this Act may contain such classifications and differentiations and may provide for such adjustments and reasonable exceptions as in the judgment of the Expediter are necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this Act. The Expediter shall have power to forbid the exportation to any foreign country of any lumber or other materials which are needed for the housing program.

"SEC. 4. (a) Whenever in the judgment of the Expediter there is a shortage in the supply of any materials or of any facilities suitable for the construction and/or completion of housing accommodations in rural and urban areas, and for the construction and repair of essential farm buildings, he may by regulation or order allocate, or establish priorities for the delivery of, such materials or facilities in such manner, upon such conditions, and to such extent as he deems necessary and appropriate in the public interest and to effectuate the purposes of this Act.

"(b) In issuing any regulation or order allocating or establishing priorities for the delivery of any materials or facilities under this section, the Expediter shall give special consideration to (1) satisfying the housing requirements of veterans of World War II and their immediate families, (2) the need for the construction and repair of essential farm buildings, and (3) the general need for housing accommodations for sale or rent at moderate prices. In order to assure preference or priority of opportunity to such veterans or their families, the Expediter shall require that no housing assisted by allocations or priorities under this section shall be sold within 60 days after completion or rented within 30 days after completion for occupancy by persons other than such veterans or their families: *Provided*, That the Expediter by appropriate regulation may allow for hardship cases.

"(c) The provisions of this section shall not be construed as in any way affecting the power of the President to assign priorities or to allocate any materials or facilities under the provisions of subsection (a) of section 2 of the Act of June 28, 1940, entitled 'An Act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes' (50 U. S. C. 633), as amended.

"SEC. 5. It shall be unlawful for any person to effect, either as principal or broker, a sale of any housing accommodations at a price in excess of the maximum sales price applicable to such sale under the provisions of this Act, or to solicit or attempt, offer, or agree to make any such sale. It shall be unlawful for any person to violate the terms of any regulation or order issued under the provisions of this Act. Notwithstanding any termination of this Act as contemplated in section 1 (b) hereinabove, the provisions of this Act, and of all regulations and orders issued thereunder, shall be treated as remaining in force, as to rights or liabilities incurred or offenses committed prior to such termination date, for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit, action, or prosecution with respect to any such right, liability, or offense.

"SEC. 6. Any person who is aggrieved by any action taken pursuant to any regulation or order issued under the authority of this Act may petition the district court of the district in which he resides or has his place of business for a review of such action, and such district court shall have jurisdiction to enjoin or set aside, in whole or in part, such action or to dismiss the petition. No such action shall be enjoined or set aside, in whole or in part, unless the petitioner establishes to the satisfaction of the court that such action is not in accordance with law, is unsupported by competent, material, and substantial evidence, or is arbitrary or capricious.

"SEC. 7. (a) Whenever in the judgment of the Expediter any person has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of any provision of section 5 of this act, he may make application to the appropriate court for an order enjoining such acts or practices, or for an order enforcing compliance with such provision, and upon a showing by the Expediter that such person has engaged or is about to engage in any such acts or practices a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order may be granted and if granted shall be granted without bond.

"(b) Any person who willfully violates any provision of section 5 of this act, and any person who knowingly makes any statement false in any material respect in any description or statement required to be filed under section 3, shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000, or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or to both such fine and imprisonment. Whenever the Expediter has reason to believe that any person is liable to punishment under this subsection, he may certify the facts to the Attorney General, who may, in his discretion, cause appropriate proceedings to be brought.

"(c) The district courts shall have jurisdiction of criminal proceedings for violations of section 5 of this act, and, concurrently with State and Territorial courts, of all other proceedings under this section. Such criminal proceedings may be brought in any district in which any part of any act or transaction constituting the violation occurred. Such other proceedings may be brought in any district in which any part of any act of transaction constituting the violation occurred, and may also be brought in the district in which the defendant resides or transacts business, and process in such cases may be served in any district wherein the defendant resides or transacts business or wherever the defendant may be found. Any such court shall advance on the docket and ex-

many years and just now are becoming interested in conditions that the miners are working under. I hope that resolution is not a little straw bridge by which the gentleman who introduced it hopes to walk out from under his responsibility.

Mr. SAVAGE. I think probably it has just been brought to the attention of the country more recently than it was before.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. I was very much concerned because I notice that the gentleman referred to Sidney Hillman and John L. Lewis, who I understand are deadly enemies. I do not believe that Sidney Hillman addressed any letter to the Members of Congress supporting John L. Lewis. But William Green, the head of the American Federation of Labor, did. I notice the gentleman did not mention Mr. Green or the American Federation of Labor. Can he tell us why?

Mr. GIBSON. I am glad you brought that to my attention because I have that letter and I mean to cover that matter. I want to tell you for your benefit that they are not enemies, but friends and allies. Bill Green, for whom I once had very high regard and great respect, after reading the letter he wrote to John Lewis, convinced me that his purpose and his motives are no purer and no higher than those of John Lewis or Sidney Hillman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request that at the place I interrogated him earlier I may insert the quotation from Dr. Edgar L. Warren's testimony which I cited at that time?

Mr. GIBSON. That is all right with me provided you insert it as your own language and not mine because I am not conversant with the facts.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As a matter of fact, it will not be my language, but it will be the language of Dr. Warren, together with the citation of his testimony.

Mr. GIBSON. What I meant is that it is being inserted in the RECORD by you. I am not questioning the veracity of it, but I want to speak on subjects only on my own knowledge and I will insert things in the RECORD only on my own knowledge.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am glad to have that understanding.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield.

Mr. SAVAGE. The gentleman has not yet answered my question. He did comment on it. But my question was, Would the gentleman be willing for the Congress to help these workers in remedying these conditions if they are found to be as reported?

Mr. GIBSON. I think the coal miner has the worst work of any man in the world. I do not know what he is paid. I think it is very timely that this Congress investigate and see if their wages are sufficient and also investigate to see what his working conditions are.

Mr. SAVAGE. And their living conditions?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, and living conditions. I have been told by some that the wages are very good and by others that they are not. I am not an enemy of the men who go down in the earth to do that work. It is hard. But I do not think that the power to tax should be put into the hands of John Lewis or any other man to set up a life insurance or health fund for anyone. I think their wages should be sufficient to take care of them and their own health funds, just like you and I and farmers and other people of this Nation have to do. I see no harm in making an investigation. If it is done with sincerity and with proper purpose, much good can come from it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

(Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include therein a quotation.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BAILEY, for Monday, May 13, on account of illness in immediate family.

To Mr. HARE, for Monday, May 13, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Commitee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3936. An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Commitee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3936. An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 13, 1946, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

(Thursday, May 16, 1946)

There will be a hearing before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary on the bill (H. R. 5089) to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941, beginning at 10 a. m. on Thursday, May 16, 1946. The hearing will be held in room 346, House Office Building (Judiciary Committee room).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1282. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Clerk, House of Representatives, transmitting a list of reports which it is the duty of any officer or department to make to Congress (H. Doc. No. 573), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Accounts, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 159. Joint resolution to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until July 1, 1946; without amendment (Rept. 1995). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOOD: Committee on Un-American Activities submits report on the subject of the sources of financial aid for subversive and un-American propaganda (Rept. No. 1996). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 613. Resolution authorizing that there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives additional copies of House Report No. 1980, accompanying the bill (S. 7) to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure; without amendment (Rept. No. 1997). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 6219. A bill to authorize the commandant of the United States Coast Guard to accept enlistments of certain individuals for duty at lifeboat stations during the year 1946; with amendment (Rept. No. 1998). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1999. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 6336. A bill to authorize the administrator of the War Assets Administration to lend or sell surplus property equipment for use at the twenty-eighth annual national convention of the American Legion; with amendment (Rept. No. 2001). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 6371. A bill to amend certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2002). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1980. An act to continue in effect section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, relating to the exportation of certain commodities; without amendment (Rept. No. 2003). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6305. A bill to make permanent the provisions of the act of July 11, 1941, prohibiting prostitution in the vicinity of military and naval establishments; with amend-

ment (Rept. No. 2004). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 6405. A bill to amend section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code in respect of distributions by personal holding companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 6406. A bill authorizing the State of Texas, acting through the State Highway Commission of Texas, or the successors thereof, to acquire, construct, maintain, and operate a free bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Del Rio, Tex.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas:

H. R. 6407. A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 6408. A bill to authorize the War Shipping Administration and the Maritime Commission to make available certain surplus property to certain maritime academies; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 6409. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to declare certain strikes contrary to the national interest and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 6410. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to lease the interest of the United States in minerals in or under certain real property located in Muskogee County, Okla.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GORE:

H. Con. Res. 147. Concurrent resolution authorizing an investigation of working conditions in the anthracite and bituminous mining industries; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. Res. 614. Resolution making H. R. 4051, together with committee amendments, to grant to enlisted personnel of the armed forces certain benefits in lieu of accumulated leave, a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolution were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 6411. A bill for the relief of Joseph E. Killian, Jr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

H. R. 6412. A bill for the relief of G. H. Lazarus, Jr., and Jesse F. Bewley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 6413. A bill for the relief of J. W. Dopson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6414. A bill for the relief of G. E. Enslen, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 6415. A bill granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Higley West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1875. By Mr. HEFFERNAN: Petition of Mary S. McDowell, of 25 Rugby Road, Brooklyn, N. Y., and signers, in opposition to conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1876. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, against the closing of Fort Devens and the Lovell General Hospital; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

79TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
2d Session } { No. 1995

EXTENDING THE SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940 TO JULY 1, 1946

MAY 10, 1946.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. MAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. J. Res. 159]

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the resolution (S. J. Res. 159) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until July 1, 1946, having considered the same, submit the following report thereon, with the recommendation that it do pass.

The resolution herewith reported is made necessary in view of the fact that the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, expires by virtue of its own limitation on May 15, 1946. On April 15, 1946, the House of Representatives considered and passed H. R. 6064, a bill to extend the Selective Training and Service Act with certain amendments for a period of 9 months. This measure has been pending in the Senate since that date without action. It is hoped that the 6-week period covered by this resolution will give the Senate an opportunity to give the measure appropriate consideration.

○

Union Calendar No. 587

79TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. J. RES. 159

[Report No. 1995]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 9, 1946

Referred to the Committee on Military Affairs

MAY 10, 1946

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

JOINT RESOLUTION

To extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until July 1, 1946.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 16 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "May 15, 1946" and inserting "July 1, 1946".

Passed the Senate May 9 (legislative day, March 5), 1946.

Attest: LESLIE L. BIFFLE,

Secretary.

Union Calendar No. 587

79TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. J. RES. 159

[Report No. 1995]

JOINT RESOLUTION

To extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until July 1, 1946.

MAY 9, 1946

Referred to the Committee on Military Affairs

MAY 10, 1946

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

DIGEST OF
CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Legislative Reports and Service Section
(For Department staff only)

Issued May 14, 1946
For actions of May 13, 1946
79th-2nd, No. 89

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....1,4
Claims..... 4
Congressional reorganization.....17
Corn.....20
Dairy industry.....24
Electrification.....14
Feed shortage.....9,22
Flood control..... 6
Food production.....23
Forestry.....1,25
Housing.....1,25
Labor.....16
Labor, farm..... 2
Law, administrative..... 3
Lend-lease.....11
Livestock and meat..... 8
Loans, farm.....7,12
Personnel.....19
Poultry..... 9
Price control...10,15,21,24
Prices..... 9
Relief, foreign.....23
Research.....19
Rivers and harbors..... 5
Roads..... 1
Rural rehabilitation....12
Selective service..... 2
Small business.....18
Subsidies.....1,25
Trade, foreign.....18
Transportation.....13
Veterans.....12
Wheat shortage.....13,20
Wildlife.....24

HIGHLIGHTS: Both houses agreed to conference report on Patman housing bill, which authorizes price control and subsidies on new housing; Rep. Tarver objected to provision for forest roads; ready for President. House passed new selective-service extension bill but prohibited induction of fathers and provided for induction of only those between 20 and 30; rejected amendment to provide more specifically for farm-labor deferment. House Rules Committee cleared administrative-law bill. Senate committee reported Cooley farm-credit bill with language of Bankhead bill. Reps. Gross and Barden criticized Secretary Anderson's request for a 10% reduction in pig production.

HOUSE

1. HOUSING. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 4761, the Patman housing bill, to be known as the "Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946" (pp. 5012-5, 5032-6). This bill will now be sent to the President.

The bill creates the office of Housing Expediter and authorizes the President, with Senate confirmation, to appoint him within any existing agency or as an independent official. Authorizes the Expediter to formulate veterans' housing programs, to issue orders to other government agencies, to recommend legislation, and to cooperate with government and other groups; and transfers appropriate powers of OWMR to him. Authorizes him to place price ceilings on new housing. Authorizes him to allocate or establish priorities for materials needed for urban or rural housing and farm buildings. Liberalizes the mortgage-insurance provisions of the National Housing Act. Authorizes the Expediter to provide $400,000,000 of housing subsidies to be financed by RFC, with an authorization for $15,000,000 of this sum to be used, to the extent that other funds are not available, for construction of access roads to standing timber on lands owned by or under the jurisdiction of any Government agency. Provides for termination of this Act on Dec. 31, 1947 or a date chosen by Congress, whichever is earlier.

The House vote on the conference report was 298-71 (p. 5036).

Rep. Tarver, Ga., spoke against the provision for access roads to timber, stating that the subject of forest roads was considered in connection with the agricultural appropriation bill (pp. 5034-5).

2. SELECTIVE SERVICE. Passed, 280-84, with amendments S. J. Res. 159, to continue the Selective Training and Service Act (pp. 5036-60).

Rejected, 97-165, an amendment by Rep. Arends, Ill., to provide that, in classifying registrants, local boards shall base their findings only on whether

they are necessary to and regularly engaged in agriculture (p. 5058). Rep. Lemke, N. Dak., spoke in favor of deferment of farm labor (p. 5050).

Agreed, 213-154, to amendments by Rep. Sheridan, Pa., to prohibit induction of fathers and permit induction of only those persons between 20 and 30 (pp. 5055-9).

3. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW. The Rules Committee cleared S. 7, to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure (p. 5024).

4. CLAIMS. Received from the President appropriation estimates for claims allowed by GAO (H. Docs. 578, 581, 582, and 583) and judgments rendered by district courts (H. Doc. 580). To Appropriations Committee. (p. 5061.)

5. RIVERS AND HARBORS Committee reported its omnibus bill (H. Rept. 2009)(p. 5061).

6. FLOOD CONTROL. Received the War Department's survey report on the Lehigh River, Pa. (H. Doc. 587). To Flood Control Committee. (p. 5061.)

7. FARM CREDIT. Rep. Poage, Tex., inserted a correction of the Houston (Tex.) Federal Land Bank's resolution to read:urging consideration of their resolution with reference to the suggestion that the lending power of the land bank commissioners be allowed to lapse" rather than "urging consideration of their resolution with reference to the suggestion that the Federal land banks be discontinued" as shown in the May 1 Congressional Record (p. 5021).

8. PIG PRODUCTION. Reps. Gross (Pa.) and Barden (N.C.) criticized Secretary Anderson's request for a 10% reduction in pig production (pp. 5022-3).

9. FEED SHORTAGE. Rep. Voorhis, Calif., spoke favoring increased poultry and other farm prices in view of the increased feed prices (p. 5021).

10. PRICE CONTROL. Rep. O'Toole, N.Y., urged that the Banking and Currency Committee determine "where the hundreds of thousands of dollars that are being expended to wipe out OPA are coming from" (p. 5020).

Rep. Smith, Ohio, criticized OPA "illegal tactics," referring to an OPA "tear sheet" as a violation of the use of Federal funds for influencing Congressional conduct (p. 5022).

11. LEND-LEASE. H.Doc.568(see Digest 87) includes a letter from the Budget Bureau stating that $1,897,000 is for this Department's administrative expenses and maintenance charges on plants and facilities acquired from such funds.

SENATE

12. FARM CREDIT. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendment H.R. 5991(the Cooley bill)substituting the language of S.1507(S.Rept.1329)(p.4981). The Bankhead bill amends the Bankhead-Hones Farm Tenant Act so as to authorize tenancy loans to repair or improve family-type farms, enlarge undersized farms, refinance farms in certain circumstances, or make improvements in view of changing conditions; to make veterans eligible for such loans; to prohibit such loans unless the farm is of a size and type suitable for an efficient family-type unit; to limit the value to the county average; to permit at least $[illegible],000 to be used in each State; to permit veteran loans to be made from special appropriations without regard to State limitations; to provide a straight authorization for administrative expenses instead of the 5% limitation; to make previous and subsequent appropriations subject only to limitations of Title I; to permit grants to individuals for rehabilitation and to health cooperatives; to make veterans eligible for rehabilitation loans; to provide a straight and unlimited authorization for rehabilitation-loan appropriations; to make several changes in

for funds in order to make available Government timber resources for the housing program. We stressed the fact in the hearings that we thought every possible effort should be made to make those resources available. If the Forest Service felt any need of any funds for the purpose of building access roads other than those for which provision has been made, and in the amount of $15,000,000 additional money it failed to indicate that fact to the membership of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. Therefore, it seems to me that this $15,000,000 is something that has been flopped into the bill by somebody who wanted to show how much he thought of the veterans. It would not do the veterans any good and unless it does it is unfair to the American taxpayer. I cannot understand and so far nobody has offered to explain just why this $15,000,000 should have been dumped in here. Perhaps $15,000,000 is not enough to excite anybody's attention.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. MASON. The understanding is that private timber, being a scarce article, will be put under the supervision of this Expediter and then it would come under the provisions of this $15,000,000.

Mr. TARVER. The conference report reads:

> Access roads to standing timber on lands owned by or under the jurisdiction of an agency of the Government—

That could mean nobody else except the Forest Service; and the Forest Service, as I have said, has indicated no need for this $15,000,000. So why in the world there should have been $15,000,000 included here is impossible to understand unless it is simply the desire of somebody to show that he is accomplishing something for the veteran, which, in my judgment, he is not.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I should like to be helpful in this, but as I understand the powers conferred by this bill, Mr. Wyatt can take any part of the $400,000,000 which we give to him and use it to induce those who own timber lands to turn those timber land or any part of them over to him in connection with this program and that as soon as they come under the direction of this agency then he can use any part or all of this $15,000,000 for the building of access roads to that timber.

Mr. TARVER. If that is the purpose of including this $15,000,000 then why is it not made clear in the conference report? If the purpose is to build access roads in the national forests then the necessity for the authorization is certainly not only apparent but cannot be made apparent because there is no necessity for it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman on that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

FINAL HOUSING BILL IS GOOD LEGISLATION—VETERANS' PROGRAM NOW CAN MOVE INTO HIGH GEAR

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, probably no act of the Seventy-ninth Congress will be of more benefit to the American people than last Thursday's vote on premium payments in the housing bill. In keeping with the finest traditions of our form of Government, out of the fire and fury of controversy and debate has come a good law—a law that will bring homes to hundreds of thousands of our returning servicemen. The bill, as now agreed upon in the conference report, should provide a firm, sound legislative foundation on which the President can establish a building program such as this Nation has never before seen in its history.

Many irresponsible statements have been made about this bill which are not deserving of an answer and which I will ignore in this discussion.

It is true that a good deal of time has elapsed since last November 20, the date on which I had the honor to introduce this particular legislation into the House of Representatives; but that time has been well spent. As I said when the bill first came before the Banking and Currency Committee for consideration, it contained many rough spots which needed ironing out, and I stood completely ready to accept any amendments which might offer a better or more practical way to provide housing for our veterans.

I had spent 6 weeks in writing the bill, and had sought the counsel and advice of experts in the housing field—both within and without Government—but, as all of us know, no man can foresee all the contingencies and the obstacles which might arise in consideration of such a measure, nor its effect on all the differing phases of our economy.

In these ensuing months the measure has been continually hammered and polished. Defects have been found and torn out. Misunderstandings have been corrected until now, as the measure moves toward final legislative action, we have a sound, workable act. In view of these facts, I repeat again, these months of work have been very beneficially spent.

As it stands today, the bill contains the same working principles with which we started out. It provides for a Housing Expediter with sufficiently broad powers to take the necessary steps to gear Government and industry into a high-speed machine to produce the greatest possible number of houses in the shortest space of time. It will permit the Expediter to attack the housing crisis with the same speed and dispatch with which we attacked our production problems during the war.

It gives veterans first priority on new shelter being built. It channels existing supplies of materials into the lower cost homes that veterans can afford to buy. It provides for liberalization of loan guaranties so that financing is removed as an obstacle to home construction.

Designed strictly as an emergency measure, it is set to expire on December 31, 1947, so that the extraordinary powers granted to the Expediter will not remain too long in the hands of the executive agencies—yet the time limit should be sufficient to meet the problems involved.

Through the use of guaranteed markets, the bill will give the necessary incentive to permit establishment of the prefabricated housing industry on a volume production basis. This provision should go a long way toward introducing new materials into America's housing; toward modernizing our antequated system of building codes; toward opening new fields of enterprise for all builders; and finally, through use of the unparalleled American know-how in mass production, toward providing more houses at less cost than our Nation has ever had.

Finally, the Congress saw fit to provide $400,000,00 to be used as premium payments to spur production of all building materials. The President has described this provision as the "heart" of the building program. Unquestionably, this provision will be the major factor in enabling all of our productive facilities—little mills as well as big ones—to go into full capacity production making the materials that the country so desperately needs; yet, at the same time, avoiding the inflationary spiralling of prices which could so easily bring disaster to the builders, as well as the buyers.

Naturally, I would have liked to have seen ceiling prices imposed on existing homes to hold down uncontrolled inflation. Now our only hope is that increased production of building materials, spurred by premium payments, will build new houses rapidly enough and at low enough prices to save the situation before present homes go so high in price that the great mass of the people cannot buy them.

As it stands now, H. R. 4761 is a good bill. As Mr. Wilson Wyatt, the Housing Expediter, said:

> This throws the veterans' housing program into high gear.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio) there were—ayes 130, noes 65.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 298, nays 71, answered "present" 1, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

YEAS—298

Abernethy	Beckworth	Bryson
Adams	Bell	Bulwinkle
Allen, La.	Bennet, N. Y.	Bunker
Almond	Bennett, Mo.	Burch
Anderson, Calif.	Blemiller	Byrne, N. Y.
Andrews, Ala.	Blackney	Camp
Andrews, N. Y.	Bland	Campbell
Angell	Bloom	Canfield
Auchincloss	Bolton	Cannon, Mo.
Barden	Boren	Carlson
Barrett, Pa.	Boykin	Carnahan
Barry	Bradley, Pa.	Case, N. J.
Bates, Ky.	Brooks	Case, S. Dak.
Bates, Mass.	Brown, Ga.	Celler
Beall	Brown, Ohio	Chapman

Chelf	Heffernan	Patman
Chiperfield	Hendricks	Peterson, Fla.
Clason	Henry	Peterson, Ga.
Clements	Herter	Pfeifer
Coffee	Heselton	Philbin
Cole, Kans.	Hess	Pickett
Cole, Mo.	Hobbs	Pittenger
Colmer	Hoch	Ploeser
Combs	Hoeven	Plumley
Cooley	Holifield	Poage
Cooper	Holmes, Wash.	Powell
Courtney	Hook	Price, Fla.
Cox	Hope	Price, Ill.
Cravens	Howell	Priest
Crosser	Huber	Quinn, N. Y.
Cunningham	Hull	Rabaut
D'Alesandro	Izac	Rabin
Davis	Jackson	Rains
Delaney, James J.	Jennings	Ramey
	Johnson, Calif.	Randolph
Delaney, John J.	Johnson, Luther A.	Rayfiel
		Rees, Kans.
D'Ewart	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Resa
Dirksen		Richards
Dolliver	Johnson, Okla.	Riley
Domengeaux	Judd	Rivers
Dondero	Kean	Robertson, Va.
Doughton, N. C.	Kearney	Robinson, Utah
Douglas, Calif.	Kee	Robsion, Ky.
Douglas, Ill.	Keefe	Roe, Md.
Doyle	Kefauver	Rogers, Fla.
Drewry	Kelley, Pa.	Rogers, Mass.
Durham	Kelly, Ill.	Rogers, N. Y.
Earthman	Kerr	Rooney
Eberharter	Kilday	Rowan
Elliott	King	Ryter
Elsaesser	Klein	Sabath
Elston	Kunkel	Sadowski
Engel, Mich.	Landis	Sasscer
Ervin	Lane	Savage
Fallon	Larcade	Sharp
Feighan	Latham	Sheridan
Fenton	LeCompte	Sikes
Fernandez	Lesinski	Simpson, Ill.
Fisher	Lewis	Slaughter
Flannagan	Link	Smith, Maine
Flood	Luce	Smith, Va.
Fogarty	Ludlow	Somers, N. Y.
Forand	Lynch	Sparkman
Fuller	McConnell	Spence
Fulton	McCormack	Springer
Gallagher	McCowen	Starkey
Gamble	McDonough	Stevenson
Gardner	McGehee	Stigler
Gary	McGlinchey	Sullivan
Gathings	McKenzie	Sundstrom
Gavin	McMillan, S. C.	Talbot
Geelan	McMillen, Ill.	Talle
Gerlach	Madden	Taylor
Gifford	Mahon	Thom
Gillette	Maloney	Thomas, N. J.
Gillie	Manasco	Thomas, Tex.
Goodwin	Mankin	Thomason
Gordon	Mansfield, Mont.	Tibbott
Gore		Torrens
Gorski	Marcantonio	Traynor
Gossett	Martin, Iowa	Trimble
Graham	Martin, Mass.	Vinson
Granahan	Mathews	Voorhis, Calif.
Granger	May	Vorys, Ohio
Grant, Ala.	Michener	Vursell
Green	Miller, Calif.	Walter
Gregory	Mills	Weichel
Hagen	Morrison	Welch
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Murdock	West
	Murphy	Whitten
Hall, Leonard W.	Murray, Tenn.	Whittington
	Murray, Wis.	Wickersham
Halleck	Neely	Wigglesworth
Harless, Ariz.	Norblad	Wilson
Harness, Ind.	O'Brien, Ill.	Winstead
Harris	O'Brien, Mich.	Wolverton, N. J.
Havenner	O'Konski	Wood
Hays	O'Neal	Woodhouse
Healy	O'Toole	Worley
Hébert	Outland	Zimmerman
Hedrick	Pace	

NAYS—71

Allen, Ill.	Clippinger	Hill
Andersen, H. Carl	Cole, N. Y.	Hoffman
	Crawford	Holmes, Mass.
Andresen, August H.	Curtis	Jenkins
	Dworshak	Jensen
Arends	Ellis	Johnson, Ill.
Arnold	Ellsworth	Jones
Barrett, Wyo.	Fellows	Jonkman
Bishop	Gibson	Kilburn
Bradley, Mich.	Gillespie	Kinzer
Brehm	Griffiths	Knutson
Buffett	Gross	LeFevre
Byrnes, Wis.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Lemke
Chenoweth	Gwynne, Iowa	McGregor
Church	Hale	Mason
Clevenger	Hancock	Miller, Nebr.
Norrell	Schwabe, Mo.	Stockman
O'Hara	Schwabe, Okla.	Sumner, Ill.
Phillips	Scrivner	Taber
Rankin	Shafer	Tarver
Reed, Ill.	Short	Wadsworth
Reed, N. Y.	Simpson, Pa.	Winter
Rich	Smith, Ohio	Woodruff
Rizley	Smith, Wis.	
Rockwell	Stefan	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Brumbaugh

NOT VOTING—60

Bailey	Grant, Ind.	Norton
Baldwin, Md.	Hand	Patrick
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hare	Patterson
Bender	Hart	Reece, Tenn.
Bonner	Hartley	Robertson, N. Dak.
Buck	Hinshaw	
Buckley	Horan	Rodgers, Pa.
Butler	Jarman	Roe, N. Y.
Cannon, Fla.	Johnson, Ind.	Russell
Clark	Keogh	Sheppard
Cochran	Kirwan	Stewart
Corbett	Kopplemann	Sumners, Tex.
Curley	LaFollette	Tolan
Daughton, Va.	Lanham	Towe
Dawson	Lea	Wasielewski
De Lacy	Lyle	Weaver
Dingell	Mansfield, Tex.	White
Eaton	Merrow	Wolcott
Engle, Calif.	Monroney	Wolfenden, Pa.
Folger	Morgan	
Gearhart	Mundt	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Monroney with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Lyle with Mr. Mundt.

Mr. De Lacy with Mr. Bender.

Mrs. Keogh with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Roe of New York with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Bailey with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Kopplemann with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.

Mr. Dawson with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Horan.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Hand.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Grant of Indiana.

Mr. Hare with Mr. Gearhart.

Mr. Lanham with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Stewart with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Patterson with Mr. Butler.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Buck.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Towe.

Mr. Folger with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Lea with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. SHARP changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. RAMEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD immediately preceding the vote on the conference report on the veterans' housing bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend and revise their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

TO EXTEND SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to unanimous consent heretofore obtained, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 159, to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until July 1, 1946.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 159, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. According to the consent request under which this bill is called up, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] for 1 hour.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, the membership of this body knows that we have had in effect during the entire period of the war—in fact, prior to actual hostilities—what is known as the Selective Training and Service Act, the law under which we raised our Army for the wars through which we have just passed. A year ago it would have expired but for the fact that your Committee on Military Affairs brought to the House of Representatives an amendment extending it for a period of 1 year, or until midnight tomorrow. I believe the record will disclose that when it was extended the last time for the period I have just mentioned it was done by unanimous consent in less than 5 minutes. We were then at war. We were then engaged in actual conflict throughout the world.

The act is again about to expire. This House passed on the 10th day of April a bill which would have extended it until February 15, 1947. That bill has been pending in another body since the 15th day of April, or 1 day less than 1 month.

The other body advises me, after about six or seven trips to see about the matter, that it is in a log jam where it cannot take up anything except the pending bill, which is the one commonly known as the Case bill. That has finally been brought up in the Senate.

In that dilemma it passed on last Friday Joint Resolution 159, which merely provides that section 16 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "May 15, 1946," and inserting "July 1, 1946." In other words, the pending resolution extends the original Selective Service Act, as amended, until July 1. I do not know what was in the mind of

the proponent of the resolution at the time it was passed or prepared.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Does that mean it extends the act as passed by the House?

Mr. MAY. No. It means the original act, not the act which we passed on April 10.

Mr. DONDERO. That act exempted boys 18 and 19 years old. If we extend this act until July 1, does that mean that boys in high school 18 and 19 years of age will be taken out before they graduate next month?

Mr. MAY. I do not know whether it means they will be taken out, but it does mean they can be taken out.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I understand that there are some 140,000 of our youth who have been deferred in order to complete their school semester which will end before July 1. Is it not possible, if we extend this law until July 1 as proposed in the pending resolution, that all of these 140,000 boys who have heretofore been deferred will be inducted?

Mr. MAY. That is my understanding of the situation, and, furthermore, I understand that instead of there being 140,000 there are somewhere between 160,000 and 200,000 who will be eligible and subject to immediate induction under the provisions of the law.

Mr. Chairman, we are up against the situation that unless this act is extended before midnight tomorrow there will be no selective-service law in effect and there will be no power or right in the local draft boards or the Selective Service Bureau to induct a single individual. So this House is up against the proposition of either discontinuing selective service now or passing the pending resolution.

Mr. Chairman, as I said a moment ago, I made five or six trips to the other body in an effort to expedite the matter in order to get it into conference so that we could write and bring to the House a bill that would cover all of the mooted questions involved. Within the last 2 hours I talked to the Senate leader and he tells me it is utterly impossible to consider it, if it is amended, for the purpose of even concurring in a House amendment.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman said he made several trips over to the other body to urge them to expedite action on the House bill so you could get it in conference. Does the gentleman want to change the House bill or is he satisfied with the House bill?

Mr. MAY. The gentleman knows I will be contending for the House bill when it comes to conference. I do not care to commit myself in advance, which I would regard as highly improper. I cannot say what I would do in conference, but the gentleman can imagine what I will do.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. In other words, the gentleman would be willing to have the Senate change our bill?

Mr. MAY. I did not say that.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. What the gentleman means to say is that he is standing on the House bill then?

Mr. MAY. I would like to get the House bill that is now in the Senate either passed without amendment or passed with amendment and sent to conference so that we can complete the legislation and bring it back to this House for consideration. I will say this, that I have not backed up on anything I have stood for yet.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Referring to the 160,000 boys 18 and 19 years of age, is it not a fact that if they should be drafted, the ordinary administrative process would take at least a month to 6 weeks to function to get any portion of those boys in the Army?

Mr. MAY. I think it would take at least 6 weeks, and I believe if this resolution passes that the Senate will take up our bill and dispose of it as soon as they dispose of the pending Case bill. I have been assured that that would be done.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Can the gentleman give the House the picture whether or not it is absolutely necessary to do it; at least, in regard to taking these 18- and 19-year-old boys?

Mr. MAY. Of course, I have never thought it was necessary to take them and I did not think so when I offered the amendment to exclude them, and I do not think so yet, but we are in a dilemma here where we have either got to act or let the whole works suspend and drop, and I do not think that that would be the wise way to do it. I think it ought to go to conference, and I think it ought to be considered deliberately and cooly.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I gather from the gentleman's remarks that he was told by the Democratic leader in the Senate that there was no possible chance to get an extension of this act if the House changed the Senate proposal in any way; in other words, he intimated, it seems to me, that we would not be able to go to conference even if we changed the bill?

Mr. MAY. That is exactly right.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I want to say to the gentleman that I believe that the House, rather than accept a mandate of that character, should give the Senate the opportunity to kill this legislation if it cares to.

Mr. MAY. If the gentleman feels that way, that is his right, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. In the gentleman's opinion, would there be any danger in prohibiting the induction of any youth during this 6-weeks period of extension?

Mr. MAY. I do not think there is any danger in the situation if we do not induct anybody for the next 6 weeks, but the danger is in permitting a law to terminate that would then have to come back for reenactment and we would have to go over the whole works again as we did in the beginning.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I wish to say to the gentleman that my intention was to convey to him the idea that if I could have my way about it I would take the position the gentleman takes, and I would have the House insist upon its position on this matter and pass it back to them. That is what I would do.

Mr. MAY. What I am trying to do is to keep from having to do the work all over again.

Mr. WOODRUFF. As a matter of fact, how are you going to get to conference unless you do something of that kind?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I wonder if the gentleman can inform the House how long the original draft extension bill, which the gentleman proposed and which was passed by the House recently, has been pending in the Senate.

Mr. MAY. I have stated that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. MAY. I stated in the beginning that it has been over there since the 18th of April.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. There has been sufficient time for the Senate to act.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. In other word, the other body put this House in the position where the ox is in the ditch and we have to comply or the law will have terminated?

Mr. MAY. That is correct, unless the Senate will in the meantime accept the House bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I believe my views as to the extension of the Selective Service Act are well known. I have favored the extension of the Selective Service Act as is for 9 months. That is neither here nor there today, to my mind, but I should like to make a few observations on the situation as I see it.

We passed the Selective Service extension, such as it was, on the 15th day of April, and it went to the Senate. It is most unfortunate that the Senate has not seen fit to act upon that up to the present time. The fault is obviously

theirs. The facts are that they have not acted upon it, and they are in a situation over there at the present time, whether we like it or not, under which they will not act upon it and cannot act upon it for some little time.

The Selective Service Act expires tomorrow night at midnight, unless we pass this resolution. The resolution in effect is nothing more than the Senate's saying to us, "Will you give us until July 1 to consider the bill which you sent us on April 15?" That is all there is to it, to my mind.

I have heard a great many arguments for amending this resolution. The resolution is nothing more than a stop-gap. Our bill is in the Senate. It represents the views of the House of Representatives. It is there today. To put the same amendments into this resolution that we put into the House bill would have no real effect upon the situation either for those who are against selective service or those who are for it.

The answer seems to me conclusive. We either agree to the Senate resolution and give the Senate until July 1 to act upon the extension of the Selective Service Act, and, if they do not act upon it by July 1, selective service will expire then, or, if we fail to agree to this resolution tonight, or if we insist upon amendments in any substantial form whatever, we are killing selective service tomorrow night at midnight. That is all there is to it. It is just a question of how we vote, and when we do vote I hope there will be a record vote on it so we will know where everyone stands.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The original bill passed by the House suspended inductions for how long?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It suspended inductions until October 15.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. This bill will permit the 18- and 19-year-old boys to be drafted until July 1?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Until July 1.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Then the Senate could very well pass another resolution extending the original draft for 6, 8, or 9 months as of July 1, as they get up to that point.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Of course, that would be possible.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. Relative to the gentleman's statement that failure to pass this resolution will end the draft tomorrow night, we must take into consideration, as I see it, the fact that there are still 1,700,000 inductees in the United States Army. That is as of May 1, according to Selective Service. The reemployment rights of all these men will be taken from them if this act expires tomorrow night, if we permit it to lapse. In that connection, may I say to the gentleman from Michigan, I have a bill that was on the Consent Calendar last week, and on which we are going to the Committee on Rules tomorrow to get a rule, which will extend that permanently.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Then if you should get a rule on that bill, the bill would also have to go to the Senate, and we have no assurance that they will ever pass that bill, any more than we have that they will pass the Selective Service Act extension.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is quite correct.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the following gentlemen be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD: Mr. HESELTON, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. ADAMS, and Mr. BENNET of New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, there appeared in the editorial columns of the New York Times on Wednesday, May 8, 1946, an editorial which I would like to quote. It is entitled "Congress and the Strike" and is as follows:

While the Government conciliator declared yesterday that he had made a proposal to clear the way for settlement of the coal strike, and while both operators and union representatives denied that any serious proposal had been made, a rising chorus of criticism came from Congress directed against Mr. Lewis for precipitating the strike, and against the President for doing nothing about it.

Congress is now back in a familiar phase of what seems to be a perpetually recurrent political cycle with regard to labor. Small strikes are ignored, no matter how frequent. Threatened strikes of Nation-wide importance are usually ignored until they become realities. Even these are treated complacently until the strike has reached a point where it threatens the economic life of the Nation. The strike is then generally bought off by the administration by granting substantially what the strikers demand. As soon as this happens Congress breathes a sigh of relief and forgets about the whole matter. The labor problem is treated as if it did not exist. No one dreams of appointing an expert commission to study the matter and recommend a rounded program of labor legislation. One would think that no major strike threatening the economic life of the Nation was ever going to occur again.

It does, however, occur again. The country demands action from Congress. Congress demands action from the administration. Those who, in more quiet perlods, have been urging moderate steps toward the restoration of a better balance in Federal labor legislation think this an opportune moment to urge their moderate proposals again. But just as those proposals were ignored in quiet times on the ground that there was no need for them, so they are now rejected on the ground that they are obviously too late, and too moderate, to stop the existing strike and solve the existing crisis.

It is now 3 months since the House passed the Case bill, which has been allowed to slumber quietly in the Senate. The Case bill was itself a measure passed by the House in haste and anger during a strike wave. It was not a particularly well considered measure, and it had what appear to be some unworkable provisions. But it did propose a few moderate reforms that were long overdue. Yet even these were rejected as extreme. The Senate committee to which it was referred could find nothing fundamental in existing Federal labor law that needed correction. But those who have refused to do anything to modify the Wagner Act (which has done more than any other measure to strengthen the strike weapon, and has hence greatly increased the frequency of resort to strikes) dismiss any effort to modify that act now, not on the ground that such a step would be too extreme, but on the ground that it would be too weak to be helpful in the present crisis. In short, many of those who would not take moderate measures in time are the very ones who are now driven to advocating drastic measures, ranging from Government seizure to the outlawry of strikes.

May I emphasize the following sentence:

No one dreams of appointing an expert commission to study the matter and recommend a rounded program of labor legislation.

It is obvious that the author of the editorial was not familiar with some of the action of the House on February 5 and 6 last.

To make the record clear, I wish also to quote the amendment offered on February 5 by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] as it appears on page 942 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

On page 11, after section 9, line 21, insert a new subsection, section 9 (a): "SEC. 9 (a). It shall be the further duty of the Board to make a broad and comprehensive study of the field of labor-management relations from the viewpoint of both labor, industry, and the public to determine what adjustments are necessary to promote continuity and regularity of employment, industrial peace, and the uninterrupted production and distribution of goods and services for commerce. The Board shall make its final report to the President and to the Congress, including recommendations with respect to legislation, not later than June 30, 1946."

In the remarks of the gentleman from New York, page 943 of the RECORD, he outlined the background of the amendment as follows:

This amendment has not been hastily drawn and submitted at the last minute. It is the result of the labors of several Republican Members of Congress who have been meeting off and on for the past 2 or 3 weeks in an effort to make some lasting contribution toward the difficult task of helping American industry to operate at maximum efficiency, which it must do if we are to have steady employment for the greatest possible number of Americans.

This amendment was agreed to in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and was subsequently incorporated as section 9 (a) of H. R. 4908. This appears at page 1095 of the RECORD of February 7.

On February 6 another amendment was offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] to the Adams substitute. It appears at page 1041 of the RECORD and is as follows:

At the end of section 12 insert the following new section, to be numbered section 13:

"TEMPORARY LABOR-INDUSTRY RELATIONS COMMISSION

"SEC. 13 (a). There is hereby established a Temporary Labor-Industry Relations Commission (herelnafter referred to as the Commission) to be appointed by the President by and with the consent of the Senate and to be composed of (1) five members representing the public; (2) two members representing labor; and (3) two members representing

management. Any member may, when unable to attend a meeting of the Commission, authorize another member to act and vote for him in his absence. A vacancy in the Commisison shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the Commission and shall he filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

"(b) The Commission shall select a chairman from the public members. A majority of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, and the power conferred herein may be exercised by a majority vote.

"(c) For the purpose of this section, the Commission, or any subcommittee designated by it, shall have authority to administer oaths and affirmations.

"(d) In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person, the Commission may invoke the aid of any court of the United States having jurisdiction of the person and such court may issue an order requiring the appearance and testimony of such person. Any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

"(e) It shall be the duty of the Commission to make a broad and comprehensive study of the field of labor-management relations from the viewpoint of labor, industry, and the public to determine what adjustments are necessary to promote continuity and regularity of employment industrial peace and the uninterrupted production and distribution of goods and services for commerce. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the Commission in its investigation shall inquire into:

"(1) The underlying causes of labor-industry disputes and the factors obstructive of their settlement, including, among other things, the effect of governmental policy both in the labor-industry and in other fields;

"(2) Whether special principles, policies, and practices should be applicable in the case of enterprises, interruptions in the continuous operation of which would vitally affect the health or safety of the people and, if so, what special principles, policies, and practices should be applicable in such cases;

"(3) Existing impediments to the success of collective bargaining procedures and how they may be improved, with special reference to the possibility of further strengthening mediation and conciliation services;

"(4) The possibility of further improvement in procedures for the adjudication of controversies as to the interpretation and application of contracts arrived at through collective bargaining, and the peaceful settlement of grievances arising under such contracts or otherwise in the course of employment;

"(5) Means by which, without impairment of the essential rights of either labor or management, the obligations of each may be enforced;

"(6) The possibility of further clarifying and defining the respective rights and spheres of authority of labor and of management;

"(7) Problems arising in connection with the selection of representatives for the purpose of collective bargaining and disputes between labor organizations relative to the foregoing and other matters;

"(8) Problems arising in connection with strikes or lockouts having objectives other than the furtherance of labor-industry disputes within the trade or industry in which the strikers or employers are engaged;

"(9) Means by which all forms of violence, espionage, intimidation, and other unlawful conduct on the part of any parties to labor disputes may effectively be eliminated; and

"(10) The problem of the most effective utilization, in the public interest, of new discoveries, inventions, and techniques, and the elimination of practices restrictive thereof and, at the same time, the minimization of the hardships resulting from the introduction of such new discoveries, inventions, and techniques, in connection with which investigation the Commission shall consider, among other things, the effect of existing laws and the regulations and practices of governmental bodies administering such laws.

"(f) The Commission shall make its final report to the President and to the Congress, including recommendations with respect to legislation, not later than October 1, 1946.

"(g) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary to cover the expenses of the Commission. Such expenses shall be paid upon certification of the chairman of the Commission and shall include compensation for members, not to exceed $25 per diem, employment of experts, stenographic and other services by contract if deemed necessary, transportation, rent of office in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, purchase of necessary books and documents, printing and binding, and such other expenses as the Commission deems necessary, without regard to the provisions of any other act.

"(h) All authority granted under this section 13 shall terminate at the expiration of the Seventy-ninth Congress."

2. Renumber sections 13, 14, and 15 as sections 14, 15, and 16, respectively.

It is difficult to reconcile the rejection of this amendment in terms of the acceptance of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET], since this amendment was an effort to define more specifically the purpose and scope of the study provided for in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET].

In any event, it now appears from the form of this bill as it is now being considered, and I refer to pages 4902 and 4903 of the RECORD for May 10, that the proposal has been eliminated. Because of that, this group, to which the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] referred, is introducing identical resolutions providing for the study referred to by the writer of the editorial and for specific recommendations of legislation. We believe it should receive the prompt and vigorous support of the representatives of labor and industry and from the public as a whole. We are confident that it can develop a constructive approach to sound legislation in the field of labor-industry relations.

We were heartened by the introduction last Friday by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] of the resolution for the establishment of a joint committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of conditions in the mining industry and by the endorsement of that study by the majority leader. We hope that we may have their support in this effort to make a comprehensive study in the full field of industry throughout this Nation.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the following members—SHERMAN ADAMS, New Hampshire; AUGUSTUS W. BENNET, New York; JOHN W. HESELTON, Massachusetts, and myself, of the House of Representatives, have joined in introducing today the following resolution providing for a comprehensive review of the whole matter of labor-industry relations:

Joint resolution to establish a Temporary Labor-Industry Relations Commission and a Joint Committee on Labor-Industry Relations

Resolved, etc.—

TEMPORARY LABOR-INDUSTRY RELATIONS COMMISSION

SECTION 1. (a) There is hereby established a Temporary Labor-Industry Relations Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Commission) to be appointed by the President by and with the consent of the Senate and to be composed of (1) five members representing the public; (2) two members representing labor; and (3) two members representing management. Any member may, when unable to attend a meeting of the Commission, authorize another member to act and vote for him in his absence. A vacancy in the Commission shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the Commission and shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(b) The Commission shall select a chairman from the public members. A majority of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, and the power conferred herein may be exercised by a majority vote.

(c) For the purpose of this section the Commission, or any subcommittee designated by it, shall have authority to administer oaths and affirmations.

(d) In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person, the Commission may invoke the aid of any court of the United States having jurisdiction of the person and such court may issue an order requiring the appearance and testimony of such person. Any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

(e) It shall be the duty of the Commission to make a broad and comprehensive study of the field of labor-management relations from the viewpoint of labor, industry, and the public to determine what adjustments are necessary to promote continuity and regularity of employment, industrial peace and the uninterrupted production and distribution of goods and services for commerce. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the Commission in its investigation shall inquire into:

(1) The underlying causes of labor-industry disputes and the factors obstructive of their settlement, including, among other things, the effect of governmental policy both in the labor-industry and in other fields;

(2) Whether special principles, policies and practices should be applicable in the case of enterprises, interruptions in the continuous operation of which would vitally affect the health or safety of the people and, if so, what special principles, policies, and practices should be applicable in such cases;

(3) Existing impediments to the success of collective bargaining procedures and how they may be improved, with special reference to the possibility of further strengthening mediation and conciliation services;

(4) The possibility of further improvement in procedures for the adjudication of controversies as to the interpretation and application of contracts arrived at through collective bargaining, and the peaceful settlement of grievances arising under such contracts or otherwise in the course of employment;

(5) Means by which, without impairment of the essential rights of either labor or management, the obligations of each may be enforced;

(6) The possibility of further clarifying and defining the respective rights and spheres of authority of labor and of management;

(7) Problems arising in connection with the selection of representatives for the purpose of collective bargaining and disputes

between labor organizations relative to the foregoing and other matters;

(8) Problems arising in connection with strikes or lock-outs having objectives other than the furtherance of labor-industry disputes within the trade or industry in which the strikers or employers are engaged;

(9) Means by which all forms of violence, espionage, intimidation and other unlawful conduct on the part of any parties to labor disputes may effectively be eliminated; and

(10) The problem of the most effective utilization, in the public interest, of new discoveries, inventions, and techniques and the elimination of practices restrictive thereof and, at the same time, the minimization of the hardships resulting from the introduction of such new discoveries, inventions, and techniques;

in connection with which investigation the Commission shall consider, among other things, the effect of existing laws and the regulations and practices of governmental bodies administering such laws.

(f) In exercising its powers, functions, and duties under this act—

(1) the Commission may constitute such advisory committees and may consult with such representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, consumers, State and local governments, and other groups, as it deems advisable;

(2) the Commission shall, to the fullest extent possible, utilize the services, facilities, and information (including statistical information) of other Government agencies as well as of private research agencies, in order that duplication of effort and expense may be avoided.

(g) The Commission shall make its final report to the President and to the Congress, including recommendations with respect to legislation, not later than November 1, 1946.

(h) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary to cover the expenses of the Commission. Such expenses shall be paid upon certification of the chairman of the Commission and shall include compensation for members, not to exceed $25 per diem, employment of experts, stenographic and other services by contract if deemed necessary, transportation, rent of office in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, purchase of necessary books and documents, printing and binding, and such other expenses as the Commission deems necessary, without regard to the provisions of any other act.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON LABOR-INDUSTRY RELATIONS

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a Joint Committee on Labor-Industry Relations, to be composed of seven Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The party representation on the Joint Committee shall, as nearly as may be practical, reflect the relative membership of the majority and minority parties in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(b) It shall be the function of the Joint Committee—

(1) to make a continuing study of relations between labor and industry; and

(2) to report to the Senate and House of Representatives not later than December 1, 1946, the results of its inquiries together with its recommendations for proposed legislation by bill, resolution, or otherwise based upon the report of the Temporary Labor-Industry Relations Commission which shall be referred to the Joint Committee for consideration and report to Senate and House of Representatives, by bill or otherwise, and from time to time thereafter to make such other reports and prepare and submit such bills and resolution embodying such recommendations to the Senate and House of Representatives as it deems advisable.

(c) Any proposed legislation on the subject of labor-industry relations, which has been prepared by the Joint Committee, and introduced by bill, resolution, or otherwise in the Senate or House of Representatives shall be referred to the Joint Committee for consideration and report, by bill or otherwise, at any time to the Senate or House of Representatives.

(d) Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman among its members.

(e) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings as it deems advisable, and, within the limitations of its appropriations, the joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems necessary and advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall not exceed 25 cents per hundred words. The joint committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, and facilities of the departments and establishments of the Government, and also of private research agencies.

(f) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, the sum of $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this section, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.

Our resolution contemplates a searching inquiry into the basic causes of labor-industry disputes and a complete review of existing Federal laws and their administration. It is designed to provide the basis for changes in existing laws and administration, where necessary, and to deal with many problems which to date have not been given adequate, if any, attention.

Obviously, our resolution will have no direct effect in settling the present coal strike. The primary responsibility in this immediate crisis rests with the administration for we believe that the President has adequate power, under existing law, to deal with the situation. If he has any doubt as to his power or wishes further legislation from Congress on the subject, we have no doubt that, upon his request, it will be enacted. That, however, is not the primary purpose of our resolution.

No single factor is responsible for our present difficulties. There is, however, a widespread belief that one of the great contributing causes has been the inadequacy of Federal policy as expressed both in existing legislation and in the manner in which the laws have been interpreted and administered. It is imperative, therefore, that Congress provide at once procedures for a complete review of governmental policy in this field. The fact that great numbers—perhaps the great majority—of the people of the country are deeply dissatisfied with the situation affords, in itself, more than sufficient reason to impell Congress to undertake this task immediately.

Indeed, we believe this should have been done long ago. We do not here attempt to assess the blame for it not having been done, or even to present fully the reasons why it has not been done. It is perfectly true, however, that what is everybody's business is nobody's business and it is further true that the committees of both Houses of Congress, within whose jurisdictions the matter falls, have not had adequate staff or financial resources to do the job properly.

Accordingly, we have been faced from time to time, and particularly within recent months, with one crisis after another. At the time of each, everyone has agreed that a complete review of Federal policy in labor-industry matters should be made but, as each succeeding crisis is resolved in one way or another and the tension is eased, the matter is forgotten until the next crisis arises.

We attempted to have this matter dealt with when the House had under consideration the so-called fact-finding bill recommended by the House Labor Committee at the suggestion of the President, and, in fact, at our instance, a modified provision on the subject was included as an amendment to the so-called Case bill. That provision, however, appears to have been discarded.

Hasty, piecemeal legislation on the subject will provide no permanent solution. We believe it is completely apparent that whatever action, if any, may be taken by Congress to deal with the immediate crisis, or whatever may be the fate of the Case bill, the need for the investigation proposed by our resolution will still remain. Perhaps it will be even greater if, as is so often the case in time of strain, legislation should be adopted which is ill-considered and ill-advised.

Our resolution provides for a commission, adequately financed and staffed, to which would be assigned the primary responsibility for making the study and preparing recommendations, including legislation based thereon. Its report would be made to the President and to Congress by November 1 of this year and would be referred to a special joint committee of the Senate and the House, also created by the resolution. That committee would be charged with the duty of receiving and of reporting directly to both Houses the legislation which it considers necessary, not only on the basis of the commission's report but on the basis of any other information which it receives and study which it makes.

Moreover, the joint committee would be a continuing body charged also with the function of following this subject in the future and of keeping Congress abreast of developments in this field.

The procedure to be established by the resolution would insure that legislation recommended by the special committee would be brought directly to the floor without delay. While the commission is not to be limited in any way in investigating any subject which it deems relevant, we would suggest that you examine the particular subjects to which, among others, the commission's attention is directed by the resolution.

It is the duty of the Government to establish and maintain a policy, as well as a framework of legislation and ad-

ministrative procedure, in this field which the great body of American opinion will recognize and accept as sound, reasonable, and fair. We are deeply confident that such a policy and such a framework can be developed and maintained if, first, the facts underlying the difficulties in our labor-management relations system are brought to light, and understood, and second, intelligent and fair-mined men devote themselves to the development of solutions of the problem which those facts present.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, there is a very definite legislative responsibility on Congress in the present strike crisis. The country expects more than stop-gap legislation designed simply to meet the crisis in coal or transportation. The country will not be satisfied if Congress fails to make a careful and complete study of our whole labor-industry system. There has been no effective work done in this Congress designed to determine what is wrong with that system. Everybody knows, including Congress, that our labor-management system is not working well. There have been a variety of ideas presented for modification of the laws regulating the system. Up to date there has been no logical approach designed to coordinate those ideas and to recommend a solution to present difficulties.

There is no more important legislative responsibility confronting us today. There is no problem, the solution of which promises such important results. The people demand a settlement not only of the coal strike but of the unknown number of industrial disputes ahead which will result only in additional loss of wages, production shortages, public inconvenience, and economic stagnation. The people are entitled to action by Congress. Congress fails to meet its responsibility if it does not proceed immediately to find out what is wrong with this system and what is needed to straighten it out.

Today, I have joined in the introduction of a resolution providing for a temporary Labor-Industry Relations Commission and a Joint Committee on Labor-Industry Relations to provide for the study of the whole labor-management relationship problem which is needed as a beginning for constructive action. This resolution in part was submitted on February 5 as an amendment to H. R. 4908 and appears on page 942 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date. The amendment was subsequently adopted by the House on February 7. The resolution was carefully drafted, has since been perfected and offers a feasible method for procedure to the study of the difficulties in our present labor-management relations and the most reasonable cure of the strike situation. Such study must be followed by action by the Congress. The people are looking for constructive action and are impatient with congressional temporizing.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make the following statement with regard to the identical joint resolutions introduced in the House today, May 13, by Representative ADAMS of New Hampshire, CASE of New Jersey, HESELTON of Massachusetts, and myself.

Everyone is clamoring for a solution to the labor-management mess which has involved our country in a series of tremendously costly strikes since VE-day and, of course, the action of Mr. John L. Lewis in bring the Nation's business almost to a standstill in recent weeks has dramatized the shortcomings of the provisions heretofore made by the United States Government for dealing with disputes between employers and employees.

The danger is that the House may, in the heat of its anger at Mr. Lewis, pass legislation designed to punish him without getting at the underlying causes of these disturbances and without providing machinery for determining why labor in general is dissatisfied and what contribution the Government can make toward eliminating the reasons for this dissatisfaction.

Here again the Congress is faced with the same problem which it almost always encounters. It does not have any substantial quantity of unbiased factual data on which to base its conclusions. The same is true when it tries to make intelligent cuts in the Federal pay roll, This was evidenced recently when the House had to resort to adoption of the so-called Dirksen amendment forcing Government agencies to absorb any increased cost brought about by raises in salaries of Government employees without increasing the present over-all pay roll. The proper way to have done this would have been to first study the whole Federal structure by means of a committee of experts employd specially for thast purpose and then to have passed legislation based on the report of that committee but an effort which I have been making for over a year to have such a study made has been completely thwarted by the committee which has charge of the so-called Fulton resolution providing for such a study.

No one who writes in to me demanding action to solve the labor-management problem seems to know how to do it and I don't either. It is my hope that the adoption of the resolutions which I mentioned will furnish me eventually with the details of a comprehensive plan which I can support and in view of the fact that this House, in connection with the debate on the Case bill, has already once adopted a substantially similar resolution, I feel sure it will be glad to act favorably again and it would seem that the Senate should by this time be convinced of the need for similar action.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, and Members of the House, I do crave your close and earnest attention. Just about 1 month ago, on April 15, the House of Representatives by an overwhelming vote, 290 to 108, or more than 2 to 1, by a majority of 182, passed the bill H. R. 6064, an act to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

It is a very short bill. It consists of less than four pages. The other body, a branch of this Congress, has had a whole month in which to consider the the three and a half or four pages of this measure. But to refresh your memories, I want to tell you exactly what we provided for in H. R. 6064:

First. We exempted 18- and 19-year-old boys.

Second. We declared a holiday on induction from May 15 to October 15, 1946—a provision known as the Vinson amendment.

Third. We established the size of our armed forces in section 2 of the act.

Fourth. We established the length or period of service, 18 months, for all men heretofore or hereafter inducted into the service.

Fifth. We exempted fathers from conscription.

Sixth. We left it to the local draft boards to decide, and they were given sole and exclusive authority to decide, whether a registrant is necessary to or regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor—the deferment of farmers.

Seventh. Subsection (b) of section 6 sets the date of the expiration of the act on February 15, 1947, or such earlier date as may be specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress. And all of the functions, responsibilities, records and property of the Personnel Division of the Selective Service System shall be transferred to any agency of the Federal Government which the Congress might designate.

Now, gentlemen, you who only a month ago voted by an overwhelming majority of more than two to one for the seven specific provisions that I have pointed out in this act must decide today whether or not anything has transpired since then to cause you to change your positions.

The House bill as amended, which we passed on April 15, met with the overwhelming approval of the American people and they still want that bill.

If the act expires at midnight tomorrow, it will not be the fault of the House of Representatives. We faced the issue. We went on record. We stood up and were counted. The world knows where we stood then and I hope it will find out where we stand now.

Apparently some people in this country and some members of our Government are more concerned in taking a whole month's time in debating the giving away of $4,400,000,000 of the American taxpayer's money, which we do not possess, to a foreign country, than they are in facing a great national crisis such as the coal strike or in dealing with this immediate and pressing problem of the extension of the draft.

I do not approve for 1 minute, sir, the parliamentary maneuvering and the reprehensible tactics employed by anyone to postpone until the eleventh hour the making of such a vital decision and then to have Members come on the floor of the House and try to cram down our throats something that was passed in 5 minutes' time without debate in another body; after our House Committee on Military Affairs held lengthy, thorough, and exhaustive hearings on this measure; after it was fully debated in this House and passed by an overwhelming majority; and after the other body had fad a full month in which to consider it.

We have had only since last Friday to consider this little, simple Senate Joint Resolution 159 which would extend the draft—not the bill which we passed a month ago, the bill H. R. 6064, but which would simply extend the original draft.

What would it do? You know why they want to extend the time until July 1. Do they think they are fooling anyone in this House? They cannot fool even a poor ignorant hill billy from the Ozarks like myself. We all know that hundreds of thousands of high school students are graduating the latter part of this month and in early June. Within 3 weeks most of those teen-age boys, 18 and 19 years old, will be let out of school, and this little resolution to extend the time of induction for 6 weeks is nothing more than a guise to catch those boys of teen age, to take them away from their homes, when we know they make willing but unsatisfactory policemen and they are not suited for occupational duties.

Mr. Chairman, if I had the time, I would like to give you some figures. When we go back into the House, I am going to ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks the Army's calculations, the Army's own figures, which beyond peradventure of doubt prove that the draft is not needed.

ARMY FIGURES PROVE NO DRAFT IS NEEDED

The Army asks on July 1, 1947, 1,070,000 troops.

The Army will have on July 1, 1947, 62,000 Air Corps officers, 68,000 ground force officers—deduct 130,000; 940,000 balance.

Fifty thousand Philippine Scouts—deduct 50,000; 890,000 balance.

There are 25,000 WACS now in service. Since many are in for duration and 6 months, 12,000 is a conservative estimate of those remaining until July 1, 1947—deduct 12,000; 878,000 balance.

One hundred and sixty thousand men drafted between January 1 and May 15, 1946, of whom Army samplings reveal about 50 percent later volunteer—deduct 80,000; 798,000 balance.

Volunteers at 30,000 a month, July 1 to December 31, 1946—deduct 180,000; 618,000 balance.

Volunteers at 20,000 a month, January 1 to July 1, 1947—deduct 120,000; 498,000 balance.

Volunteers, October 1945 to July 1, 1946, at least 800,000—deduct 800,000; 302,000 surplus.

One-year and 18-month enlistments which expire before July 1, 1947—deduct 257,842; 44,158 surplus.

WITHOUT ANY DRAFT EXTENSION

With a 6-week draft extension at least 65,000 including some deferred students will be drafted—add 65,000; 169,158 surplus.

With at least 20-percent pay rise, General Textor predicted a 30-percent increase in volunteers—add 66,600; 175,758 surplus.

During the past 7 months since VJ-day we have had over 737,000 men volunteer into the Army, if you please, the largest volunteer army that any country in all history ever had, and they are coming in by the thousands every day since the House passed the increased pay bill, even though the Senate has not yet passed it.

Gentlemen, do not let someone throw a hot potato in your lap. They are passing the buck. When we come to vote this afternoon, I am going to offer to strike out everything after the enacting clause of Senate Joint Resolution 159 and substitute House bill 6064 which we passed by more than a two-to-one majority. Do not let anybody tell you it will die. If they can pass Senate Joint Resolution 159 in 5 minutes last Friday, we can send this resolution, as amended, that we pass today, over to them and they can pass it in 5 minutes, or we can go to conference and resolve our differences and reach an agreement.

We are not trying to crowd anyone. But I am getting a little sick and tired of being pushed around and being placed behind the eight ball continually. We have suffered that all through this war—on the passage of the Selective Service Act, on the drafting of nurses, on the work-or-jail bill, on the problem of strikes.

Do not let the press and radio frighten anyone. They can report that the Congress has failed to act, but they cannot truthfully say that the House of Representatives has ignored its duty or shunned its responsibility. We have passed the draft bill. We have passed several labor bills. The Senate finally has reached consideration of their watered-down measure, but it is no more important than the present measure before us.

I hope when I offer my motion to strike out everything after the enacting clause of this Senate Joint Resolution 159 and substitute the provisions of the House bill 6064 as we passed it a month ago, that you men who had the courage to stand up and vote for it then will do likewise this afternoon, and we will get it through before tomorrow night.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, there is one thing I will say about the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], and that is that he is consistent. He opposed the original draft bill. He bitterly fought its extension when it carried by only one vote in this House. I just wonder what would have happened had his views prevailed at that time. I wonder if the Germans and Japs might not be in possession of this country.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. No; not right now.

Likewise I wonder just what our position in world affairs will be if his position today prevails. There is no use, of course, for me to consume your time if you are against any kind of extension of the draft in order to get over this terrible crisis in which we and our allies find ourselves.

The situation is this, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] so well said, this is stop-gap legislation. There is one thing my friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], forgot to tell you when he was speaking of the majority by which the House passed the bill it sent to the Senate. Many of us had to vote for the emasculated bill to keep it alive. It was that or let selective service die. I happen to be the one who begged, pleaded, and demanded a roll-call vote on the elimination from the draft of the 18- and 19-year-olds, but it was impossible to get a record vote on that amendment. Later I tried to get a roll-call vote on the question of the draft holiday until after the primary elections and then throw it into the lap of the President, and I could not get a record vote on that. I hope before this discussion is over that we will be able to get on the record how every man in this House feels about the situation.

I am just as loath as anyone to draft teen-age boys, but I am also thinking about some other boys because I have some facts here from the War Department and I do not believe they would misrepresent the situation.

Of the 1,700,000 draftees now in the Army to which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] referred, 600,000 will have had 18 months' service on July 1. Not only that, but I want to put on record one other fact, and that is that of those men 120,000 are fathers, several thousand of whom have never seen their babies. Their babies have been born since they were overseas. Literally thousands of them have been in the islands of the Pacific or within the borders of Europe from 12 to 17 months already. They deserve to come home Where are you going to get replacements?

Why all this hue and cry and all this great sympathy for some fine boys we do not like to induct, yet who have never served 1 day when, I repeat, 600,000 of the draftees presently serving will have had 18 months by July 1, and 120,000 of them fathers.

Now to come back to the situation that faces us. The Senate has not passed the House bill. I do not know their reason or excuse, perhaps they do not have a valid reason, but nevertheless we are confronted with a fact today, not a condition or a theory. They have not passed it. So what in the world is there left for us to do? We must be realistic. Have our honored dead died in vain? The peace is not yet won.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. No, not for the moment.

What is there left for us to do except to pass this continuing resolution? We frequently pass continuing resolutions. Why, if you fail to pass this resolution; or, as the chairman of our committee said, after conferring with the Senate leaders, fail to pass this resolution as it is before tomorrow night then selective service is dead and out of the window. Several thousand draft boards all over the country, and all their employees and voluntary workers will fold up.

But there is one other thing to which I wish to call your attention. I respectfully request that you Members have a page go to the document room and get you a copy of the selective service law as it stands today, and that you read section 8 under which every one of the 2,000,000 men left in the Army today has prior rights of reemployment. That is also dead and goes out of the window if you defeat this resolution. I say that would be an outrage to the thousands of fine soldiers now in service who would not get their old jobs back.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. No; not now.

You say to these men, literally thousands of them, who have been in combat and been overseas for 18 months and more, when they come back to their homes or rather lack of homes because not many of them have homes to come back to—120,000 of them have wives and babies—and you in effect say to them they cannot come back to their old job; and some civilian who is pretty slick and slides by the draft for some reason or other, takes the veteran's job. Are you going to place yourself on record as favoring that kind of thing? I do not propose to do anything of the kind.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The House in its bill suspended the draft until October, I believe.

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; but I would hardly say that was a courageous act.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. And reemployment rights of the veterans could be restablished by this House by a simple resolution. Is that right?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; it is true after the House refused a roll call on the political amendment you mention, it suspended operation of the act until after every primary election in the United States is held. I do not believe that the people back home thought much of the courage of Congress about that. We shirked our responsibility and passed the buck to the President.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. But the gentleman knows the act the House passed did not provide for any inductees into the Army?

Mr. THOMASON. Of course, if you have your way, we will go on a great big holiday until the 15th of October and let these boys stay overseas, because if you do not extend this there is no way in the world to get them back home. We will have to keep many men overseas to maintain the security and the peace of the world. There is still a lot of trouble and unrest in the world.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I desire to ask a question that I am sure the gentleman can answer, because I get confused by these various figures that are put out by the War Department and by things that are said on the floor. I have in my hand a clipping from a Washington newspaper of May 7 in which this opening line is found:

> The United States will have a regular standing Army of 1,000,000 volunteers by the end of June, Maj. Gen. H. N. Gilbert, Chief of Army personnel programs, predicted.

The question in my mind is this: This bill that the gentleman's committee reported out had a top limit of 1,070,000 men for the Army.

Mr. THOMASON. As of July 1, 1947.

Mr. HALLECK. If by the end of June, next month, we are to have a volunteer Army of a million, does that not approach the number of men indicated as being necessary for the Military Establishment?

Mr. THOMASON. I do not know what the gentleman has read. I did observe that it is only a prediction. I want to read from the statement given to me this morning by the office of General Paul, Chief of Personnel in the War Department, as follows:

> Some 600,000 nonvolunteer enlisted men in the Army as of July 1, 1946, may be forced to serve over 18 months. Congress has approved an 18 months' tour of service for men in the Regular Army.
>
> There is no fair reason why draftees should have to serve more than this length of time. Yet if the draft is not continued, it may not be possible for the Army to go to an 18 months' policy without falling short of its long-range needs.
>
> There are 120,000 nonvolunteer enlisted fathers estimated to be in the Army on July 1, 1946. It is highly desirable to return these men to their families as soon as possible.

In this connection may I say that the volunteer enlistments as of today furnished me by the Selective Service this morning are 736,590, but the number of enlistments have been dropping rapidly in the last month or two. We might as well be frank about it. Many of these boys who enlisted saw the draft coming. Then, too, there will be a total of 156,722 who will soon have completed their 1 year's service, and, of course, they will not go back into the service.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. If we pass the Senate resolution what assurance have we that these men who will have had 18 months' service on the 1st of July, including 120,000 fathers, will be released on the 1st of July?

Mr. THOMASON. We have this assurance: The other body, if it does pass any kind of a bill, will send that bill back here, after which it will probably go to conference in the hope we can work out a fair and just bill or determine what the majority wants, if it wants to do away with selective service.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman has had assurances from the War Department. Has he had any assurance that if we pass the Senate resolution the War Department will release the 700,000 men to which the gentleman refers?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional mintes.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, in the House committee and likewise in this body there was no objection to limiting the term of service to 18 months. I assume that if there is any law passed on the subject that will be a part of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It is also a fact that that program is in the War Department's orders now?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; and is being carried out.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. All of these 18-month men are to get out?

Mr. THOMASON. They are not drafting any fathers and they are not drafting any men over 26 years of age.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does not the gentleman think it is only fair for him to finish his statement about these 600,000 men who would be discharged on July 1 after 18 months' service? They will be discharged anyway regardless of whether there is any more drafting of men because the Army has about two and a half million men now and it wants to reduce that number.

Mr. THOMASON. There is no law now compelling that they be discharged, and we must carry out our world commitments in this terrible time of crisis and uncertainty. Why, Members of the House, we have not agreed on a single peace treaty with any nation of the world. Our delegates are meeting probably this very minute in Paris. General Eisenhower is in Tokyo today meeting with General MacArthur, and here we are going to throw our victory away almost overnight, when there is nothing to this except to continue the resolution before midnight tomorrow night. Things will remain in status quo and no change from present conditions.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. You are throwing away the pledges made before our men went to Europe and all you are doing to those men over there is to wait for another Pearl Harbor and Bataan.

Mr. THOMASON. That sounds like the same speech the gentlewoman made when she voted against the extension of selective service. I am trying to vote so that my sons and grandsons will never see a Pearl Harbor or Bataan. I am thinking of lasting world peace.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. And all we got out of this war was communism and radicalism.

Mr. THOMASON. Well, we won the war and we kept our liberty, and that is more than some people did.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. And you are working toward another war.

Mr. THOMASON. No; I am trying to prevent another world war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, this joint resolution to extend the Selective Training and Service Act is one that calls for our careful consideration. This is a very serious matter and I want to take the time to make some observations. I want to recall to Members of the House, lest we forget, that in May 1942 the American soldier was fighting a losing battle on Bataan and building bases in Iceland.

In May 1943, the American soldier was fighting in Africa and bombing Jap supply lines in Burma.

In May 1944, the American soldier was slogging through the Italian mud and about to establish a beachhead on New Guinea.

In early May 1945, the American soldier was driving through Germany, a few days away from victory, and pushing deeper into Okinawa.

Then came May 7, 1945, just about 1 year ago, when the German aggressors lost another ruthless campaign to seize world domination; and finally on August 14, 1945, when the Japanese military leaders cried for mercy and all fighting ended.

I listened in this Congress at the time to the glowing tributes paid to the Army and the Navy and the Air Corps for their magnificent victories on all the fighting fronts of the world, and we recall with all thankfulness the load of anxiety that was lifted from a world of mothers' hearts and how a war-torn world turned back to peace with a profound gratitude to the God who gave it and to the men who paid for it with their lives. We gloried in our leadership and the great victories of our fighting forces.

However, in a few short months what a great change has come over the Members of the Congress since that day of victory of VE-day, May 7, and VJ-day, August 14, 1945.

It would appear from previous discussions to which I have listened intently that the judgment of those men who led our forces and brought the war in Europe and Japan to a victorious conclusion was all wrong. The figures they submitted to us were questioned; their timing was bad, and it appears their conclusions and recommendations were unsound; and what I am now trying to determine here today is whether we are approaching the problem as hard-hitting, practical, clear-thinking Americans—realists—or whether we are carefully weighing the matter from a standpoint of expediency for our own future.

I recall how the American people clamored for a just and lasting peace. They were all out for the United Nations. They demanded the demobilization of the Army and the Navy and the Air Corps. They wanted the boys back home, and almost all of them have now been returned home; so today we have a pitiful skeleton of a military organization with a world afire with unrest and discontent, with some nations armed to the teeth, threatening to break out any moment to upset the peace of the world. I want to call to the attention of the House that mankind has been at war a total of 14 years during the past 32 years between 1914 and 1946; in those 14 years of wholesale blood-letting millions of men, women, and children have been slain. Most of them were noncombatants who found themselves trapped in the wrong countries. During those 14 years of war cities large and small were wiped out and nations pillaged. Now a universal fear of the future has gripped the hearts of men everywhere.

Here in the United States alone—where no foreign enemy has struck—nearly 1,300,000 young men have been killed or wounded, and more than $400,000,000,000 have been spent for death-dealing weapons during the past 32 years. That is our contribution toward helping to win the two world wars.

So, now, again, this problem is before us, as to what we shall do for the future.

I might say that men who have defended their countries against armed aggression are not so foolish as to think that love and soft-thinking alone are substitutes for preparedness and training; and today, I want to call to the attention of the Congress the fact that we must not fail to remember that we must do a better job of preserving the peace—that they have won—than the Nation has yet done, or their sacrifices will be lost and without justification.

What is worth having is not only worth fighting for; it is also worth protecting when we have won it, and we cannot scatter our military forces to the four winds and have this great world order, which we all crave.

Senator John Sharp Williams, in a letter written in April, 1917, at the time we were entering the First World War, spoke plainly and sharply when he said:

> It is given to every man to either eat his cake or to keep his cake, but it is given to no man to do both. A country can choose to be a great military power, and to remain in peace times upon a military footing, subtracting from education and religion and progress all along the line the cost of it; or it can choose to be a great democracy of hope and peace and progress, and knowing well before hand that if it chooses to be the latter, it must muddle and suffer infinitely in men and money when war is forced upon it. Each Nation can choose one of these two things. Nobody can choose both.

We have the right to agree or to disagree with this philosophy, but, at the present time, as when he made the statement, Senator Williams has the better of the argument.

The United States chose to disarm after the First World War; to sink its ships, to discharge its soldiers and sailors, to dismantle its forts, to put our trust in treaties that had no backing save the say-so of those we hoped were as high-minded as ourselves. It appears as though we may again pursue the same pathway.

So what happened we reaped the harvest planted by the pacifists and propagandists.

So we were confronted with the result of trusting the theorists and disdaining our practical and hard-headed realists.

Now we have learned the lesson that, God willing, we shall not so soon forget again.

What profiteth us if we gain the luxury of easy living, of a slackened civilian discipline, or the pleasure of listening to those who play the pipe of an easy and pleasant peace—backed only by wishful thinking—and lose the best of the youth of each new generation in preventable war?

If we pay the price to be assured of our national security, we shall the longer have peace.

If we attempt to maintain an easy, irresponsible peace, without the means of national security, we shall surely have another great war, and the wars will follow in succession until we either learn the hardest way, or lose altogether the recuperative strength to rise from the lazy lounges of civilian comfort to again defend ourselves in battle.

General Jan Smuts, the great South African leader said, and I quote:

> Peace without the power to back it up becomes but an empty dream.

If this land is worth defending with the bayonet and the gun, the battleship and the airplane in time of war, it is worth preparing to defend in time of peace.

Some of our boys, called into duty from civilian life in World War II, were actively engaged in this war for 3 or more years.

Three or more years were spent in fighting and dying in malaria-infested jungles; on blazing, blasted oil tankers—some for weeks with burning thirst—afloat on a raft on a brazen sea; of frost-bitten nights and soggy days in the Aleutian fogs.

Three or more years, our boys took a beating—learning to fight, while fighting.

Three or more years of desperate national spurting to make up for the time we lost as we dawdled along the pleasant pathways of pacificistic peace—but, thank God, we had the reserve strength for the final stretch of a total victory.

So let us pray that God may give us the wisdom to take those steps which will keep our Nation safe from the marauder nations of the future, and sensible enough to pay the price of peace in the coin of preparedness and security—and not in the coin of the lives and health of our next generation of youth.

This problem before us today is one that needs our careful and wise judgment. Let nothing stand in our way of reaching a decision for the welfare of our Nation. Remember this is an atomic age; when war hits again there will be no time for a rousing call to arms. It will be too late. You are the judges as to the position you take here today, and I sincerely hope and pray it will be a right one.

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHERIDAN].

(Mr. SHERIDAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-five Members are present; a quorum.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the enthusiasm that is attempted to arouse, and our patriotism, in reciting the history of what our armies have done in the last year or two, but we must be factual about it. This is most important legislation before the Military Affairs Committee of the House. In my opinion, it is shotgun legislation, because what they are trying to do in the closing hours of the selective-service law is to shoot through legislation for which there is no foundation in fact to sustain.

We passed H. R. 6064 by a tremendous majority. Nobody can honestly charge

that the House of Representatives has failed in its duty.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERIDAN. I refuse to yield at this time.

When it comes to maintaining the security of the Nation and its position in world affairs today, I yield to nobody. But we did put into the field the greatest democratic army ever known, because of our way of living, and with no draft during peacetime. Let us be fair about it. Let us take General Eisenhower's own words. He will need 1,500,000 men, and that is to be gradually reduced to 1,070,000 by July 1, 1947.

The previous speaker referred to 120,000 fathers. I see no reason why the War Department cannot release them today, because it is the attitude of this Congress, expressed in H. R. 6064, that it will be mandatory on the War Department to release either fathers who have been drafted heretofore or will be drafted at this time. So that we should make it mandatory that the War Department comply with the intent of the Congress.

In this morning's mail I received a letter from a chap in the far eastern theater. He is a private, first class. In this letter he states:

> Passes have been cut down. The reason given is that the rate of V. D. has gone up. About everything is off limits now. The hospitals are loaded with men with such cases. Most of them don't care any more what happens.

That is on the basis of 452 out of every thousand in that theater who have such an affliction. Now they want to extend the draft to July 1, take these youngsters, 81,000 of whom have been deferred in their last semester of high school, and approximately 160,000 who will become of age in the next 45 days, and put in that area these 18-year-old boys. We are charged with the responsibility of preventing it. We are the representative branch of the Government.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERIDAN. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman referred to the strength of the Army as recommended by General Eisenhower, about 1,500,000 on July 1, and 1,000,000 on July 1, 1947.

Mr. SHERIDAN. One million seventy thousand July 1, 1947.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes; 1,070,000. I understand the strength of the Army today is about 2,500,000 or 2,400,000. Is that correct?

Mr. SHERIDAN. I believe the figure is 2,100,000.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Then these men to whom the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] referred, who will have had 18 months' service on July 1, will be discharged anyway, regardless of whether the draft is extended, because the Army will have their 1,100,000 on July 1. Is that correct?

Mr. SHERIDAN. They will have more than 1,500,000. I believe the gentleman's figures are correct. And may I say that if the Senate, instead of the joint resolution, could set aside their deliberations for 5 minutes and pass the House bill that may change the whole lives of 18-year-old boys, 5 minutes could have been utilized for the passage of the pay bill whereby we increased the base pay from $50 to $75 for buck privates and to $80 for private first class.

A recent survey of men being released from the Army showed that 23 percent would have reenlisted had the pay been increased.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERIDAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Would it not be the proper thing for the Senate to consider the bill we sent over there so we would get legislation in the proper way, rather than to pass this bill which they took 5 minutes to consider, and pass, and send over here?

Mr. SHERIDAN. I believe it would. In fact, that was why I objected on Friday when they tried to circumvent the regular consideration of the bill or its consideration by the Rules Committee where it is doubtful, in my mind, whether they would have gotten a rule.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, would my able friend from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. SHERIDAN. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Two or three of the speakers have pointed out the fact that, unless we accept the Senate joint resolution, all discharged veterans will lose their right of reemployment. That is absolutely untrue as they must know, and as well as you and I know, because the House bill we passed a year ago could be continued by the Senate or enacted by the Senate which gives every one of these discharged veterans his employment rights.

Mr. SHERIDAN. That is true; and if there is any question as to the legal interpretation, this House could reenact this bill with all inductions suspended and then there would be no question of interpretation.

I may say to the gentleman from Missouri that to make doubly sure of it I have at the Clerk's desk now an amendment to that effect, likewise an amendment to take out the 18- and 19-year-old boys, and also an amendment to prohibit the induction of fathers.

But let me proceed one step further. The voluntary enlistments as of today are approximately 737,144. As of July 1, to which date this extension is made by the pending resolution, the projection of that figure would give them well over 800,000 enlistments. Of the enlistments about 83 percent are for 3 years or more. So that our commitments on the basis of Eisenhower's own figures of 1,070,000——

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERIDAN. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The figures show that of the seven-hundred-and-fifty-odd-thousand enlistments only about 53 percent are for the longer period, about 400,000. Over 300,000 of the enlistments in the Regular Army represent young men who were inducted first but who have gone into the short-term enlistment for obvious reasons and get out of the Army with a shorter term of service.

Mr. SHERIDAN. I cannot agree with the gentleman's figures for the shorter period. I think he will find the approximate figures are 15.8 percent. But had we just increased the pay of the boys 50 percent, it would mean that 23 percent of those coming out of the Army at the present time and those who will come out in the next 18 months would reenlist and would approximate the 400,000 more enlistments needed. Also, they would represent regular trained troops who have seen service in various theaters and who might under the circumstance make the Army their life's endeavor. That coupled with the voluntary enlistments would take us beyond the base figure on which the Army has projected its strength.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, throughout the entire postwar work of the Committee on Military Affairs I have given considerable thought to the matter of developing a complete and adequate peacetime program of national defense that will meet our needs for peacetime and for any possible future emergency that may arise, including the possibility of war. As I stated to the House on April 12, during the debate on the extension of the selective service, some of the most important factors of preparedness are the building of adequate stock piles of strategic and critical materials; the creating of a proper research and development program, including the training of scientists; the provision for an adequate service of intelligence and information; an adequate program of industrial production, including the setting up of pilot plants; building an adequate Army, Navy, and National Guard and Naval Reserve to meet any immediate emergency that might come up; building up an adequate reserve of trained manpower; and preserving the will to rise and defend our Nation.

In the foregoing points the building of an adequate reserve of trained manpower and the support of adequate Regular Army and Regular Navy forces come into direct conflict in the issues of military training and the extension of the draft. An adequate reserve force cannot be maintained over a period of time without universal military training and yet our highest ranking officers of the Army and Navy have told us that universal military training cannot operate simultaneously with a program of compulsory military service. For that reason I have given particular time and thought to the matter of developing a program of increased pay and other benefits that would build up our standing forces to the size needed through the system of volunteer enlistments, and unless the case for extension of compulsory military service is so strong as to amount to a situation analogous to war conditions, and unless it is conclusively proven that volunteer enlistment are wholly inadequate, we should discontinue compulsory military service at once.

The House of Representatives recognized the importance of discontinuing actual inductions when they approved amendment to the selective service extension bill recently, which amendment would defer all inductions until October 15.

However, there is another great issue involved in the measure now before you for consideration, providing for the extension of the selective service law until July 1. I refer to the fact that this measure does not provide for stopping all inductions from May 15 as provided in the bill, H. R. 6064, as passed by the House on April 15. During the proposed extension under the bill before us today the issue is not so much the clash between a universal military training program and the extension of compulsory military service as it is a clash between the extension of compulsory military service and the proper maintenance of an adequate research and development program.

To me the successful defense of our Nation in the future is more dependent upon research and development than on any other single factor. I was very greatly impressed by the statement of Howard A. Meyerhoff, geologist and executive secretary of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, before the Committee on Military Affairs, February 19, 1946. Dr. Meyerhoff was then representing engineers and scientists in the following organizations, whose total membership equals 145,000 engineers and scientists: American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Chemical Society, American Institute of Electrical Engineers, American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers, American Society of Civil Engineers, American Society of Mechanical Engineers, Electrochemical Society, Engineers Council for Professional Development, Engineers Joint Council, Engineers' Society of Western Pennsylvania, and the Institute of Radio Engineers.

Dr. Meyerhoff appeared before us on that occasion not in opposition to universal military training which was then under study by the Committee on Military Affairs nor in opposition to universal military service but he brought to us some startling information regarding the effect of World War II on the field of science and engineering. In the course of his testimony, Dr. Meyerhoff made the following statement:

> Statistically, the situation may be summarized as follows: As a direct consequence of war service, there has been a loss which was estimated by Dr. Vannevar Bush and his associates at 150,000 men of college age who would now be trained and at work in scientific and technological fields. At least 17,000 of those men would have received doctor's degrees or their equivalent in their major fields of interest, a fact which evidently means a critical loss in people qualified to carry on and to direct research of high caliber. All these losses have been sustained since compulsory military service went into effect in 1940, and insofar as a judgment may be formed from preliminary returns, the cumulative loss is not being reduced materially by returning servicemen who have taken advantage of the opportunity to continue their training at the college and university level. Many of these men are 3 to 4 years older than they were when they went into service, and the acquisition of the technical skills herein considered normally requires several years of work beyond the bachelor's degree. Comparatively few men are willing to spend this amount of time acquiring technical training after so long a period in the armed forces. In consequence, we must regard the figures given above, namely, 150,000 men at the bachelor's-degree level and 17,000 men at the doctorate level, as a net loss to the technological preeminence of the United States. Steps must be taken immediately to achieve complete recovery. No one can claim that the United States was overstocked with scientific and technological personnel in 1940 when we were compelled to turn our full attention to the serious business of war. It is not a non sequitur, therefore, to conclude that we are now alarmingly understaffed both for the requirements of reconversion in peace and for any possible military contingency that may confront us in the future. It is our conviction that the replenishment of the ranks of engineers and scientists cannot be left to chance but must be incorporated in plans for the future, whether these plans be military or nonmilitary in character.
>
> It is significant that our allies and our enemies in the war just ended placed a much higher value upon scientific and technological skill than we did. The British, the Russians, and the Germans knew, as we did, that military success was dependent upon technological and scientific success. Unlike us, however, they gave serious thought to the replenishment of scientific and technological personnel and refused to interrupt the training of students who were specializing in these fields. Indeed, certain of these countries made it possible for new students to enter programs of training in order that the exacting requirements of war and of the peace that was to follow might be met.

Dr. Meyerhoff then discussed the situation regarding enrollments in our engineering and science courses, but inasmuch as his testimony was given to our committee on February 19, and much has happened during the past 3 months in the readjustment of our GI's, especially in the colleges of the country, I called Dr. Meyerhoff today for the latest information regarding the enrollment in our engineering and science courses, and I am now able to give you a more recent report than the report set out in the hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs last February.

In 110 schools and departments in the United States there were on March 15 60,000 enrollees in engineering, 55,000 of these are veterans, but we had 110,000 enrollees in these same schools in prewar times.

Sixty-one percent of the enrollment today is in the freshman year, 19 percent in the sophomore year, 11 percent in the junior year, and 5 percent in the senior year. Practically all of the juniors and seniors are foreign students, that is, not citizens of the United States, or they are in IV–F classification.

In other sciences the figures are complete only for the upper three classes inasmuch as students usually do not indicate their major course of instruction in their freshman year. In chemistry there is today only 25 percent of the prewar enrollment. There are only 28,000 now enrolled in the upper three classes, and most of these are foreign student or IV–F.

In physics, geology, and mathematics in the upper three classes the enrollment today is only 20 percent of the prewar enrollment, but in these sciences there is an increasing number of GI's enrolled in the sophomore year.

There is another important factor involved in the field of science. Forty percent of the GI's are married, and these students will be confronted with the expiration of their Government assistance before they can complete their long courses in the sciences. Many of them will be unable to support their families and complete their course, and there is bound to be some loss of talent because of that situation.

Regarding engineering, there is another important point that has developed since the hearings February 19—the engineering enrollment of the country is below what it was the first semester of this year; in other words, the GI increase of enrollment has not offset the loss of students through inductions. From all the GI's from 5 years of induction we now have enrolled only 50 percent of 1 year's normal prewar enrollment.

There is another factor that should be given some consideration during the course of this debate; namely, there has been a very definite increase in the enrollment of foreign students in our colleges of engineering and science. There is today enrolled just a shade over 200 percent of the prewar enrollment of foreign students in engineering and science course in our American schools. There are 50,000 foreign applicants not yet taken care of, and if these are all admitted it would make eight times as many foreigners enrolled in our colleges of engineering and science as were enrolled in our schools in prewar times. This situation should bring home to us very strikingly the contrast of our own failure to appreciate the importance of research and development as compared with the importance given to this field of work by foreign countries today.

We should bear the foregoing in mind when we realize that the greatest single group available for immediate induction with the extension of selective service beyond the present school year is the group of students who have been deferred to complete the present semester of school work. Practically every one of these students who can pass the physical examinations will be taken into the Army and Navy immediately on the close of the present school year unless we stop inductions under any extension of the selective-service law.

From Popular Science of March 1946 I quote:

> Even if every possible remedial step were taken immediately, it would be 1955 or 1960 before this country could catch up in scope of research activity with Britain and Russia. Russia, where the number of higher educational institutions was increased from 91 to 782 in 20 years, opened 60 new colleges during the war.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

(Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, as I look about me here in this Chamber I see men who served in the recent war, some who served in World War I, and some in

the Spanish-American War. As I look about I see many Members of the House who had sons in the recent war. Some of those sons did not come back. That is one of the elements which makes us representatives of the people whom we represent.

There are those in the House who would prefer to see the selective service law passed and extended simply as the resolution of the Senate provides as it is now before us; however, we are confronted with a matter which I think is the ultimate thing, that most of us do not want a chaotic condition to exist and have no extension of the draft at all. I voted for the last extension of the draft in the form it was and the conditions then existing.

Let me say to the membership of the House that if we pass the resolution as it is, without the amendment which is going to be offered by the gentleman from Missouri, we are in an incongruous position. We are in the position that here is the great Committee on Military Affairs that has considered this legislation for a long time, that brought it in, and, after a great deal of debate we passed overwhelmingly in the form in which it went to the Senate on April 15, 1946. There are graduating from the schools of the country this month and next month I suppose several hundred thousand boys. How are they going to feel about us who have passed this legislation a month ago and now we turn around and pass what the Senate sent over here? Are they not going to rightfully say to us Members of the House, What kind of Representatives are you? You tell us one thing on the 15th of April and you tell us another thing today.

How are they going to feel about our sense of logic, our reason, our sense of fairness when we go back and meet those youngsters who have been hauled in by the Selective Service just as fast as they get to be 18 years of age so that they can be examined and inducted? Are you going to say that you have acted fairly, honestly, and decently to those youngsters who are graduating in the next 30 days after our action of April 15th this year.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHERIDAN. The gentleman also realizes that of those youngsters 31 percent have signed up at scientific schools and will now be taken into the Army. What is our answer to them?

Mr. O'HARA. Well, as great a thing as the study of science is, I make no distinction; as great as the unquestioned ability of these young men is to go into those scientific schols, I make no distinction; I make no distinction whether they are married or single in connection with this matter. It is just the situation whether we do one thing in a deliberate manner in this body, then because of a condition with reference to which this House has no responsibility, we turn around and run down the hill again.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask the gentleman what answer he is going to give to these other boys who have become 18 years old, who were not fortunate enough to be in school or perhaps be a graduate of a school, who have already been taken into the service and will remain in the service for 2 years simply because you refuse to take these boys?

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman's statement is not entirely fair. We are dealing with something that we have to meet now and we are not going to escape the answer to it.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. All they do with these men is keep them in Europe, presumably to prevent Russian aggression which we are still financing, and all your Army does in Europe is act as a decoy in case the Russians should start to fight us. The boys over there should be brought home immediately.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I want to make my point clear, if I may conclude without interruption, and that is, that we either adopt the amendment which is going to be offered by the gentleman from Missouri, substituting what was the deliberate judgment of this House under different conditions than we are now in, or we face the situation of placing many in the unhappy situation where we have to vote against the continuation of this act under this resolution to which we might not agree. Yet, we agree, if you please, that it is important and essential that the draft be continued until the will of the House and the will of the Senate may be worked out in whatever disagreement there may be, but if there is anything more inconsistent than merely blanketing in this resolution that comes over here different ideas compared with what our deliberate action was on the 15th of April, the House will be making a spectacle of itself which the youngsters of this country graduating in the next 30 days cannot reconcile with American fairness or deliberateness or consistency which we, as Members of Congress, should exert.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Is it not true that the young men were only deferred? I am under the impression that the question was raised that those deferred in school might then be drafted.

Mr. O'HARA. Well, that is part of it, yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. But is it not true that every young man in school is in a preferential class, unlike the one who went to work? The young man in school was deferred. He was not told that he would be drafted.

Mr. O'HARA. The matter of deferment of students has been created by Selective Service to a limited extent and rather late in the war.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, to me this is a very serious situation. When I think back to 1919, when I came out of the Army and came to Washington in March of that year, I did not have the remotest idea that we would ever be in a war again. I was so firmly convinced of this that when they talked to me about participating in national defense I said, "Why, it is useless; we will never in my lifetime be in a war again." Then I saw our country drift during the twenties and during the thirties; a great, giant strong nation, just gradually drifted into a war. Now here we are. We can condemn the other branch of Congress. We can talk about all the delays and other things, but we are faced with this situation: We have certain commitments to fulfill and we ought to keep them if we are to maintain our leadership for world peace. The Secretary of State personally told us, as well as others, that our bargaining and our program for world peace is largely dependent on the strength of our military forces. Just because the Senate may have committed a wrong or made a bad mistake bordering on tragedy let us not add to it and make a catastrophe out of it.

I believe that if we prolong the present draft law for 45 days we can get out the kind of law the Congress really wants. We have provided for the stimulation of voluntary enlistments by increasing the pay rates. We can put our house in order, and we can then lay the groundwork for real world peace. None of us thinks there is anything more important than to lay the groundwork for perpetual peace. In my opinion, the temporary retention of selective service is one of the steps we have to take to make our bargaining capacity effective and successful.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. If they want to prepare for peace they have not even taken the first step. The first step is, stop financing Russian aggression. The second step is, jerk the Communists out of our own Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not quite agree with the gentlewoman. If she had children, as I have, or the hope of grandchildren, she might look at this problem of world peace in an entirely different manner.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I have seen a lot of dumb people who had children.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That may be. The gentlewoman may think I am dumb. I distinctly do not think she is dumb. It is entirely a matter of one's attitude. She has the right to think what she will as to whether or not I am dumb, and I respect her opinion; but I at least am sincere when I say that the retention of the Draft Act now will be a distinct step in the direction of peace. I am thinking of those that come after us. I want to do what little I can with

the life I have and my experience to lay the foundation that will enable our country to lead the nations of the world to peace and away from another war.

Many people worry about these young men that are in high school and I do also. But what about the hundreds of thousands, the several millions, that served from 2½ to 4 years in the Army of the United States to protect and preserve American prestige and bring the victory that was necessary before we could build a new world of law and order and of peace. I am worried about these young men, but I am more worried about the 120,000 fathers that are in the Army and that we want to get out so they may rejoin their families. We have to get this little group of men into the Army in order to get those people out.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman well knows that the House bill we passed a month ago provides for the deferment of fathers.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes. But the House bill is not yet the law. The gentleman knows that, too.

Mr. SHORT. No, but we are trying to make it the law. The gentleman wants to hinder us.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The gentleman knows very well we do not have the time to make it the law.

Mr. SHORT. We do have time.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If the gentleman conducts a filibuster on this bill, what will happen is that the whole thing will go in the ash can. That is my candid opinion.

Mr. SHORT. If there is a delay, who is responsible for the delay?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not care who is responsible for the delay. I am not going to add to the trouble we have had by having this dumped in our lap by trying to blame the other branch of Congress, only to wake up and find the whole Selective Service System dead.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. A good many of the boys in my district came to see me when I was home last, boys of the age that would be taken into the Army under the Selective Service Act. Their remarks boiled down to just this. Every boy, almost without exception, said, "I would rather go in now and not be killed than go in later and be killed."

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is what I think is the attitude of most of those young men. They will not object to this present "stop-gap" program, when they realize they are thereby helping to lay the foundation for lasting peace.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

(Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, first I want to say, apropos of what the previous speaker said, that I do have children, one of whom served for several years in this war, and one of whom may have to contemplate going in to the service, and I hope that I can have reasonable expectations of having grandchildren.

This bill came to us last Friday with public statements from leaders in the Senate that it was necssary because of the coal strike. You recall reading that in the press. That is a fine thing to tell the American people. If we did not have a draft law and there was a coal strike, would this Congress have the audacity to say to the American people that the way to meet a coal strike was to enact a conscription law? That is virtually what they told the American people in the Senate on last Friday. Happily, the miners are back in the mines today or I suppose we would hear a great many arguments on that score this afternoon. But there is no need then in the minds of the Senate by their own statement for this legislation to be rushed through here today. The truth of the matter is that the Army authorities have not been honest with the Congress of the United States. They have been most contradictory in their statements. They have brought about an atmosphere of general confusion.

A few weeks ago in the Committee on Naval Affairs, after a great deal of questioning, we forced an admission from the Navy officials that the Navy did not have to consider the enlistment of men over 30 years of age because it was so easy to get them. Volunteer troops of mature age can be secured if the Army adopts a proper policy. My friends, the Army has failed dismally in maintaining discipline and has failed in their duty to these boys in the occupation forces. Look at their own figures. In some sections of Germany, the venereal disease rate is 427 to 1,000, while the average rate is 211 to 1,000. Those are the conditions into which you are contemplating sending these 18-year-old boys in the full flush of their innocent youth without any contact with life aside from their home and classroom experience. Why, it is atrocious even to think of it. You cannot give any adequate reply to the American people if you send these boys into an atmosphere for which the Army itself is responsible because discipline has broken down and they admit it.

The Army did not make one concrete constructive recommendation to the Congress of the United States with regard to voluntary enlistments. They did not come with a suggestion for increased pay until a month ago when they saw they could not get their bill through as quickly as they desired. Now, in the eleventh hour, the Senate comes to us with what my colleague has so aptly described as "shotgun legislation," and we are supposed to forget that just a month ago this House overwhelmingly passed an amendment to the Draft Act after great deliberation, exempting 18- and 19-year-old boys from induction into the armed forces. There is no need of inducting them. If we take this resolution which was written in the Senate, so the press tells us, in lead pencil very hurriedly, if we take it and accept it as our judgment, we deserve the condemnation of every American citizen. I cannot criticize the Senate rules, but because they have endless days of filibustering and because they do nothing to check the endless flow of oratory which halts their deliberations, they think we must succumb to their pressure at the eleventh hour. If we do take this, if we refuse to amend this resolution, we deserve the condemnation of our constituents.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I congratulate the fighting Irishman from the great State of Pennsylvania for the sound argument that he has given against our voting for this resolution which was sent over from the Senate. I quite agree with him that it was absurd and ridiculous last Friday when it was sent over here under the flimsy pretext of breaking the coal strike. As the gentleman knows, under Public Law 89 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, known as the War Labor Disputes Act, section 3 and section 10 gives the President of the United States the power to seize any plant, mine, or facility.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Virginia brought that out very, very clearly on the floor of the House last Friday.

Mr. SHORT. And it is absolutely unanswerable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired again.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I also yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Chairman, I hope we pass this Senate resolution. It gives us about 45 days to correct a great mistake we made a month ago.

When we passed a draftless draft law and took a draft holiday a month ago, it reminded me of an occasion when, in accordance with an old custom that prevails down in North Carolina; a bunch of us gathered together in a little churchyard to clean up the weeds and briars. There was a colored boy working there. He was pulling up some weeds near a tombstone. All at once he broke into laughter such as might reasonably be provoked by the act of a solemn body like this passing a draftless draft law.

I said, "George, what are you laughing about?"

He says, "Boss, don't you see that joke that is written on this tombstone?"

I said, "No, George. What is it?"

He said, "Get down here and read it."

I got down and read it. In addition to the name and the date of birth and the date of death of the deceased, there were these words, "Not dead, but sleeping."

I said, "George, what is funny about that?"

He said, "Boss, he ain't fooling nobody but himself."

Now, that is the situation with this House. When last month we passed a draft law that excused from the draft

everybody under 20 years of age, we did not fool anybody but ourselves, because everybody else in this country knows that everybody that is 20 years of age and over, who is physically qualified, is already in the Army or the Navy or the Marine Corps, or has been discharged therefrom after honorable service therein.

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak for two groups of people who cannot speak for themselves. I am a believer in extending the draft—drafting everybody from 18 years on up. I have a young boy in Japan, 20 years old. He is a second lieutenant. He writes me that practically every boy in his outfit is either 18 or 19 years of age. That is, all the soldiers and noncoms.

I want to speak to you and say this, that I am a believer in what Oliver Cromwell said: "Trust in the Lord, but keep your powder dry." I think if this Nation 25 years ago had heeded the advice of Oliver Cromwell, if we had kept our powder dry, if we had kept prepared, I do not believe we would have ever had a Second World War.

I want to speak to you for those 18-year-old boys, hundreds of thousands of them in the service who have been drafted. If you do not extend the draft, you will have to keep those boys in the service longer than they should be.

Then, I want to speak to you for another group who cannot speak for themselves. We fought a war and we fought a war that was fought for definite objects. We have won the war and now we have got to win the peace. The only way we can win the peace and speak with a tone of authority in a world where a man like Stalin rules a nation as powerful as Russia, is to keep our powder dry and let the world know that we are going to maintain an adequate Army and an adequate Navy, even if we have to draft people to do it.

I speak to you, as I say, for the 18-year-old boys already in the service who cannot speak for themselves. I also speak to you for those thousands of Americans who have suffered death on the battlefield and who cannot speak here for themselves. I speak for those described by England's hero-poet, Rupert Brooke, in these words:

These poured out the red, sweet wine of youth,
Gave up the years to be of work and joy,
And that unhoped serene that men call age;
And those that would have been their sons,
They gave their immortality.

For God's sake, do not tell those who have poured out their lives on the battlefield that this Congress is unwilling to keep this Nation strong.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia [Mrs. MANKIN].

Mrs. MANKIN. Mr. Chairman, several weeks ago the House passed a bill extending the draft. I know you all read the papers of the United States and know that nine-tenths of the newspapers of this country felt that this House had dodged an issue because of the weakness of the measure passed. We were severely criticized and we were accused of playing politics with the security of the Nation. Certainly, we shall be playing politics if we use empty excuses such as "It is not our fault. It is the fault of the Senate" and fail to pass this resolution that is before us today.

It was not our fault that Hitler invaded Poland, yet we became involved. It does not matter if the present predicament is someone else's fault. We are faced with the fact that the law extending the Draft Act is not on our statute books. The Draft Act will expire tomorrow unless we pass this resolution. I feel very definitely that we will be playing politics and that we will be gambling with the security of this Nation if we do not pass this measure. I feel that we will be letting down and we will be unheeding the advice and the needs of those men who have served us ably and who have brought us through this war successfully. I refer to our military leaders.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Does the gentlewoman feel that we should not heed also the united voices of every church denomination in the United States, the voice of both labor parties, and even the voice of those who might be drafted? Is not that a loud voice to hear likewise?

Mrs. MANKIN. I believe the most important voice to heed is the voice that calls for the security of our Nation, the United States. As General Eisenhower said:

If we pretend that the war is over when the shooting stops, we are likely to lose the aims and purposes for which we made the sacrifice of war.

We have commitments abroad. Many of our boys who are overseas should be permitted to return home. Until at least one peace treaty is signed we must keep together our draft machinery, although with our many voluntary enlistments we may not need it.

We will indeed be playing politics, if we fail our country in this critical period.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I shall support Senate Joint Resolution 159, not because I think it offers any adequate solution of our military problem but because it seems to be the only practical arrangement that can receive legislative sanction in the 30 hours before the Selective Service Act expires. I would have much preferred H. R. 6064 in the form in which it first came before this House, but H. R. 6064 was so weakened by amendments that I think it is an even worse piece of temporization than this resolution which now comes before us from the other body. If we pass Senate Joint Resolution 159 in concurrence we shall at least have gained time to produce some better considered piece of legislation.

I am in favor of Selective Service only to supplement voluntary enlistments, and I do not see how any devotee of the voluntary principle can quarrel with this program. But in this critical interim period before peace treaties have been agreed upon, and when we have ample notice that agreement on peace treaties will be enormously difficult, we ought to be resolute in maintaining our armed forces. In fact, the dismemberment of our armed forces is now advocated nowhere more vigorously than in the Communist Party line.

I vote for this resolution to prevent immediate disintegration of our armed forces and express the hope that it will enable us to concur in both branches of the Congress some adaptable military program at least for the next 12 months. The defeat of this resolution will cause jubilation among our enemies and will cause us to speak with a diminished voice at the world's council tables.

(Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield to no one in my desire to see this country have adequate armed forces and be prepared, but reports I have from the War Department General Staff show that they have now nearly 740,000 voluntary enlisted men and that they have more than a year within which to get the balance of their 1,070,000 they say they need. The last week for which they report shows that in voluntary enlistments they got 14,981. Practically 15,000 men in 1 week and they need take in only 5,000 a week in order to reach the strength they wish to attain.

Now we have all this talk about their not having adequate strength. Their own figures show they have more than 2,500,000 men in the Army now. I do not believe it is my responsibility or that of any Member of this House to keep the draft bill in effect 60 more days in order to bring in these two hundred or more thousand young men who are in high school now and who will be caught just exactly in time.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If we adhere to the arguments advanced here today we would never get through drafting boys 18 and 19 years of age.

Mr. CAMP. Why, of course not.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Another point. I visited all the counties in my district recently and I found this situation, a great many, I would say 50 or more young men told me that just as soon as the pay bill was put on the books they intended to volunteer. It is my prediction that with that pay bill enacted it will not be long until they will have more men enlisting than they can use.

Mr. CAMP. They are getting nearly three times as many enlistments now as they need to bring them up to the strength the General Staff says they want. Their own figures show that.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Furthermore, they desire to continue a law that was passed when we were at war. Here the war is over, yet they are insisting on our continuing this law that was originally passed in war time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

(Mr. BARDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, my views are pretty well known to the membership of this House on the Draft Act and its extension. I do wish to address myself for a moment to the tactics employed in connection with this particular piece of legislation. I do not like them and the rest of you do not like them. How much are you going to wince under the whip? Does any Member of this House think it is becoming of us to take this kind of a deal lying down? If so, I must disagree with you.

Mr. Chairman, I am tired of this expression down here in the well that if we do not do so-and-so by tomorrow night we will be ruined. The overwhelming sentiment of this House was to suspend the draft until October 15. The sentiment of this House and the good sense of this House said exempt 18- and 19-year-old boys; we did not think that was going to ruin us then. We do not think so now. I was in this body when the Senate kept us here until 3 o'clock in the morning and I am ready to do that again, I think somebody ought to begin to raise their voice against this kind of treatment of the House. I do not wish to be too direct, but the gentleman occupying the saddle today is laying the whip on the House. The whip does not hurt my hide because I am not going to let any bunch, I do not care what legislative body they happen to be in, do any swivel-hip, broken-field running around me in connection with a proposition of this kind.

I think what we ought to do is send the bill back as the House passed it and say: "Here it is. Now act."

So far as the War Department is concerned, there is no great emergency existing now for men and they know it. As far as that is concerned, I would suggest they pay a little more attention to trying to make their branch of the service a little more popular with the men. That would be a fine stroke and, in my opinion, it would meet with the general approval of the American people.

In this particular deal I want these 18-year-old boys looked after, as the overwhelming majority of this House wants done. We have expressed ourselves, we have written our constituency, we have notified the people. What are we going to do? Run away again? Not me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I have already said too much, but I am as sincere about this as anything I ever did in my life.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman has offered a very convincing argument to any fair-minded person. I can say that. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Some speakers have said here this afternoon that the only alternative we have of saving this draft law is to accept the Senate Joint Resolution 159. That is loose talk and it is not true, because if the Senate will accept the bill which the House sent over there, after holding exhaustive hearings, having a thorough debate here and passing it by an overwhelming majority, the draft would be continued and the benefits and reemployment rights of all veterans would continue likewise.

Mr. BARDEN. There is not a man in this House who does not know we have right now aproximately twice as many men in uniform as the Army says is necessary. If this bill does not pass by tomorrow night they will still have them. They will still have over 2,000,000 men in uniform on July 1. The War Department failed miserably in making out a case and they know it. When are they going to learn that they must deal the cards on top of the table?

There is no use arguing about it, and I am not going to play ping pong with this question any more. I do not care how many generals come to see me. I cannot agree with everything they say. I do not even agree with what General Devers said the other day, and I would not suggest that he try to make me believe it, either. The Senate has ignored the House. The War Department has assumed that we are a bunch of jelly backs. My people expect their Representative to not only have conscientious convictions but to stand by them, and that is exactly what I propose to do.

[Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, we are all for national defense. The question is just what is the best national defense. Just how much national defense do we as one of the so-called 50 peace-loving nations need?

The Committee on Military Affairs recently brought in a bill and a report. In that report they stated that the Army wanted and needed 1,070,000 men. Well, the Army still recently had 2,673,000. In place of asking for more men, they ought to discharge at least 1,500,000 of the more-than-needed men they have at present.

Of these 2,673,000, at least 700,000 are enlistees and at least another 600,000 draftees since the war with Germany ended. In addition, I am informed the Army rejected about 400,000, who attempted to enlist, because of flat feet and other unreasonable requirements and restrictions. So the Army could discharge all of the servicemen inducted prior to the surrender of Germany, and still have more than enough men left to make up the 1,070,000.

Just why all this rush of taking the teen-age boys from the farms and the colleges? Just what is the best national defense against the atomic bomb? If it is scientific training, surely these teen-age boys can get that better in colleges than in military camps.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. If the Congress today would stop the draft and say that it is not necessary in the national defense, they would lose one of the cutest little arguments they have for the British loan, and I think that is one reason this bill is here.

Mr. LEMKE. I am aware that some people want to give our America's shirt to a nation that is far richer than we are, but I am not interested in that subject just now.

Just what is national defense? I submit that the taking of more farm boys and farm help from the farms in this critical shortage of food is not national defense, but national destruction. We realize that in order to keep the armies going the farmer had to work his children and old folks from 14 to 18 hours a day. If he had lived in a city, he would have been arrested for violating the child labor laws and cruelty to the aged.

Recently while in North Dakota I saw scores of teen-age boys taken from the farms where their services are sadly needed, and sent to Army camps. I am aware that General Hershey says that North Dakota had more farm deferments than any other State. My answer is that a little knowledge, even on the part of General Hershey, is a dangerous thing.

The general forgot that North Dakota is entirely agricultural, that it is fast becoming the first State in the Union in producing agricultural products. He forgot that out of 680,000 inhabitants, 119,000, most of them from farms, left the State and engaged in war work. They have not and will not return. He forgot that the average North Dakota farm consists of 494 acres as against 150 in Iowa and 80 in Illinois. There are different factors in different States. But there can be no difference of opinion that the world needs food and needs it urgently.

The war disarranged our entire economic structure. Yet that is but a small part of the price we paid. We have lost about one-half of a generation of people. No wonder the servicemen are on the verge of mutiny. The place for a young married man is with his wife and children. The place for a single serviceman is back home renewing his acquaintance with the girl that waited.

In conclusion, if we must continue the Selective Service Act, then let us continue it, but prohibit any further induction until October 15 or until further action of Congress. That will give the Senate time to consider the House bill. It will give us time to find out what is national defense and what is blind and senseless national destruction.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, in a few minutes the committee will start to amend this resolution. Amendments will be offered to the resolution and some should be accepted. After listening to the arguments for the last 2

hours, I am certain no one in the House is very happy about the resolution that has come from the other body. I wonder if we cannot arrive at some common ground and find a solution of our differences and the unusual situation in which we now find ourselves. I understand an amendment is to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHERIDAN] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. Amendments which stop drafting 18- and 19-year-old boys and the drafting of fathers should be adopted. This House passed on these provisions. The vote was better than 2 to 1 for these amendments adopted a month ago.

Many Members of the House are hesitant about marching up the hill, and sort of marching down again. It has placed many of us in a very embarrassing position. Members who would like to see the draft continue were hopeful and felt that the other body should have taken some very definite action before this time. It has been suggested that the other body would not have time to act upon any changes that might be placed in this resolution I submitted to the Committee. It took about 5 minutes for them to send this resolution over to us. If we see fit to place some amendments in the resolution, the amendments to be offered by the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, they will have an opportunity to act on them tomorrow and they can take 2 or 3 hours instead of 5 minutes. I am convinced in my own mind that the draft is no longer needed. I am convinced that the military can get all the men they want under a volunteer system, and particularly if the other body would pass the pay bill which this House passed sometime ago to increase the pay of enlisted men and then make a concerted effort to get these men to voluntarily enlist in the Army.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I am very happy that the able gentleman from Nebraska brought out that significant point which I am sure many Members might not have heard clearly. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION], said that 50 young men told him when he was back in his district during the Easter recess that they were going to volunteer as soon as the pay bill was passed. The House has already passed the pay bill and, as the gentleman from Nebraska suggests, if the other body passes it and it becomes law, then there will be less need than ever for the continuation of the draft.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am certain that the gentleman from Missouri is correct. You know that a handcuffed and impressed army is not a good army. If you take these 18- and 19-year-old boys and continue to put them into the Army, they will not make good policemen nor the best soldiers.

I know that those gentlemen at the head of the Military Affairs Committee, who will follow me on the program, will make an impassioned plea that this bill must be passed as is tonight or things will be bad in this country tomorrow.

I do not want to approach it in the form of hysteria. This House ought to take deliberate action and not march down the hill from the action we took a few weeks ago. If you want to take out the draft holiday, I have no objection to that, but certainly we ought to be consistent. As I have said, in my opinion, the draft is no longer needed. We can get sufficient men under the voluntary-enlistment method by increasing the pay and making service in the military more attractive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this debate with a great deal of interest. I want to say that I agree with everyone who has said something critical of the manner in which this legislation is thrown back at us. I resent it just as much as any one of you may. Yet at the same time I believe we ought to be realistic and recognize the conditions that exist.

We all know that about the time we sent the House proposal to extend the Selective Service Act over to the Senate the British loan was under discussion. We know further that that was just finished at the end of last week. We know further that when it was finished there was a great clamor, not only there but among the Members of this House, in fact among many of those who have spoken this afternoon, and all over the country, urging the Senate to take up labor legislation; take up action on another bill that we had sent over there some time ago, the so-called Case bill.

We know something of the maneuvering that had to be done in order to finish up the British loan. We know that an arrangement was worked out ahead of time; that the next order of business would be the labor bill. I dare say that had the Senate not taken up the labor bill a great many of those who have been criticizing it this afternoon would have criticized it very bitterly for not taking up that particular measure. I think we should remember those things when we consider the situation in which we find ourselves.

I was not in favor of the kind of draft bill we sent to the Senate. It is true we sent it there by a tremendous vote, 290 to 108. But let no one believe that that represented the feeling of this House. That was the final vote by which the bill was kept alive. A great many of us, such as myself, voted for that bill on final passage, although I voted against both of the disabling amendments that were in it. The bill that we sent there was a demobilization measure. Even if the Senate could act on that measure by midnight tonight, is there anyone who believes that the conferees could agree and get a report back to the respective bodies in time to have it signed by the President by midnight tomorrow? It is utterly impossible. As a matter of fact, under the rules of this House, a conference report has to lie over a day, and a single objection could prevent bringing up that conference report. Oh, they say, "Let us amend this bill and send it back to the Senate." Now, let us look at the real situation. What would happen? It would go back to the Senate. The majority leader would ask unanimous consent to lay aside temporarily the pending legislation and to take up this amendment that we had sent back over there. Again it would be at the mercy of a single Member of the Senate. If they failed to agree and asked for a conference and came back to the House, a single Member could prevent a conference from being held. Again, under the rules, it would have to lie over a day.

I want to say this, looking at this thing realistically, there is no practical manner in which we can extend the Selective Service Act beyond midnight tomorrow except by adopting this resolution that is before us without any amendment. If we do not adopt it, at midnight tomorrow Selective Service dies, the boards go out of existence, the employees go off the pay rolls, the volunteer workers cease to be connected with it any longer, the machinery stops, and there is no way under the sun regardless of what has been said here, by which reemployment rights can be insured to all of those returning veterans after midnight tomorrow.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. Being realistic about the matter, does the gentleman think that if we were to amend this bill for instance so that we inserted the date "June 5" instead of "July 1," which would give the Senate 15 or 20 days to act, that would untangle the situation?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; I do not. To begin with it would be subject to the decision of a single Member of either body.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Briefly.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I recall to the gentleman's mind the fact that just the other day the majority leader of the Senate thought so little of our bill that he said the British loan must come first whether the draft were extended or not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, the thinking of the majority leader in the Senate does not establish my thinking; and whatever he may have said does not excuse us for any inaction of which we may be guilty.

Something has been said about the working of the volunteer system. It is true that we did get 15,000 for each week during April, but I want to call your attention to how the number of volunteers has been decreasing from month to month. Our heaviest month for volunteers was in November of last year. In November 1945 we had nearly 135 000 volunteers. But listen to how the number has fallen off month by month: December, 131,000; January, 113,000; February, 93,000; March, 73,000; April, 63,000. You can see where that curve is leading, it is leading to a dangerous situation.

I say again this is stop-gap legislation and I want to say to you that if it is adopted I shall be greatly disappointed if the other body does not take up the bill we sent over there and try to work

out a decent established policy by which we are to be governed over the months for which the act will be extended. I do not mean that they will wait until June 30, but I mean that within the next few days they should take it up. I regard this as purely stop gap legislation.

I want to say to you however that if this resolution is not agreed to by this House then the draft dies and those boys, 600,000 of them, who are in there already more than 18 months are going to stay there; they cannot come out, that is all there is to it; and those 120,000 fathers who are in there are going to stay there beyond July 1; they cannot come out, that is all there is to it. We may as well face the real situation.

A great deal has been said about taking these boys who are in school and who have been deferred to go to school. I do not think anyone has tried harder to protect our educational system and our educational welfare during this war than I have. I supported the amendment to defer boys in schools and colleges. I supported every amendment looking toward maintaining our educational standards during this war. Goodness knows, I hate to see a boy who has been deferred to go to school being taken out. I know what it means to him. But we have been taking these 18-year boys who were not able to go to school, we have been taking these 18-year old boys who have already graduated from high school, we have taken them and they are doomed to stay in the Army for 2 years or more if we do not pass this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the Senate joint resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 16 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "May 15, 1946" and inserting "July 1, 1946."

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHORT: Strike out all after the enacting clause of Senate Joint Resolution 159 and insert the following:

"That so much of the first sentence of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, as precedes the first proviso is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 3. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of 20 and 30, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 20 after having been required to register pursuant to section 2 of this act, shall be liable for training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States: *Provided*, That so much of the second sentence of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, as precedes the first proviso in such sentence is amended to read as follows: "The President is authorized after, and not before, October 15, 1946, to select and induct into the armed forces of the United States for training and service, in the manner provided in this act, such number of men as is required for such forces to bring them to the strength authorized by the Congress, and no monthly requisitions for men shall be made on selective service by either the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy between May 15, 1946, and October 15, 1946, and thereafter only with the approval of the President." '

"SEC. 2. The fourth proviso of the second sentence of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows: '*Provided further*, That on July 1, 1947, the number of men in active training or service shall not exceed 1,070,000 in the Army, 558,000 in the Navy, and 108,000 in the Marine Corps; and the monthly requisitions on selective service under this act by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall not exceed, after consideration of the actual number of voluntary enlistments during the previous month, the number of men so required.'

"SEC. 3. Section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

" '(b) Each man heretofore or hereafter inducted under the provisions of subsection (a) shall serve for a training and service period of 18 months, unless sooner discharged, with the exception of cadets of the Military Academy and midshipmen of the Naval Academy who have been certified by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy to have completed successfully 18 months of satisfactory service.'

"SEC. 4. Section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

" '(3) After May 15, 1946, no individual who has a child or children shall be inducted without his consent for training and service under this act. As used in this paragraph the term "child" includes a child legally adopted, a stepchild, a foster child, and a person who is supported in good faith by the individual in a relationship similar to that of a parent and child but such term does not include any person 18 years of age or over unless such person is physically or mentally handicapped.'

"SEC. 5. Section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

" 'In carrying out the provisions of this subsection the local selective-service board in classifying the registrant shall base its findings solely and exclusively on whether the registrant is necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor.'

"SEC. 6. Section 16 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

" '(b) All of the provisions of this act, except the provisions of sections 3 (c), 3 (d), and 8, and the fourth proviso of the second sentence of section 3 (a), shall become inoperative and cease to apply on and after February 15, 1947, or on such earlier date as may be specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress for that purpose, except as to offenses committed prior to such date. On February 15, 1947, or on such earlier date as may be specified in such concurrent resolution, all of the functions, responsibilities, records, and property of the Personnel Division of the Selective Service System shall be transferred to such agency of the Federal Government as the Congress may designate, or, if not so designated, to such agency of the Federal Government as the President may prescribe.' "

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment just offered by the gentleman from Missouri on the ground that the exact language in another bill has been acted on favorably by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair states to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], that that is a matter for the committee to pass on, not the Chairman. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, there is very little more I can say. I made my position clear when I spoke in general debate. At that time I pointed out the seven different things which the House bill stood for:

First. It exempted 18- and 19-year-old boys from induction;

Second. It declared a holiday on inductions from May to October of this year;

Third. It established the size of our armed forces;

Fourth. It established the length of service not to exceed 18 months;

Fifth. It exempted fathers;

Sixth. It deferred real farmers; and

Seventh. It set the date of expiration of the act.

It has been said here this afternoon that this is stop-gap legislation. I suppose that is a good name for it. But how wide is the gap? The gap is extended from May 15, day after tomorrow, from midnight tomorrow evening, until July 1 or for 6 weeks, until 200,000 teen-age high-school boys in this country become eligible and are inducted.

If this is such an important measure, if the life of our Nation is at stake, if the failure to accept the Senate joint resolution will spell doom for this Nation, why in the name of common sense was not the resolution brought in before the eleventh hour? Only last Friday was it brought in, only 3 days have we had this joint resolution to consider. And the House was not in session on Saturday and Sunday to publicly debate it. The other body has had the House bill for a whole month to consider, after that bill had been considered by your House Committee on Military Affairs for weeks, listening to long, controversial testimony debated on the floor and passed by a majority of 2½ to 1.

Mr. Chairman, if the committee passes the amendment I have offered it will stop debate on other amendments that will be proposed here tonight, perhaps every amendment that has been included in the House bill, along with other amendments. I do not know how long we will be kept here, and I do not care, but if the committee adopts the amendment I have offered it will close debate on other amendments, it will send this bill back to conference, it will serve notice on the other body that we mean business. It will give us time, it will avoid even a conference if the Senate will accept it, the law will be continued and all the benefits of these discharged veterans will not be denied as has been suggested.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. Does the gentleman have any assurance that if we pass the Senate resolution that on or about the 28th of June another stopgap resolution will not come back?

Mr. SHORT. I do not have that assurance nor does the gentleman from Oklahoma or anyone else. I do know, however, that if we accept the Senate resolution we will continue in force not this bill we passed a month ago, but the

original Draft Act that will make eligible all these 18- and 19-year-old boys in this country, 200,000 of them, graduating within the next 3 weeks.

It seems to me that there was some conniving somewhere, I will not say where, to put this off, in order that these men might be inducted, and that the voice of this House which is equal, I think, in importance, to any other branch of the Government, shall not be heard. I agree with my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] that the time has come when the Members of this body should rise, not in anger, but in righteous indignation, to defend the dignity of this House, its privileges and prerogatives, instead of yielding to these reprehensible parliamentary tactics and dilatory maneuvers of infinite delay.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which is presented now is a very clever parliamentary maneuver which would seem to, on its face, perhaps offer possibilities. I want to call attention to several things, however, that would happen in the event this amendment is adopted by this House today. The first thing that I would call to your attention is the fact that H. R. 6064, which is the amendment, is in itself an amendment throughout to the original draft bill. Naturally, if the draft law itself expires tomorrow night at midnight then we are presenting to the Senate for consideration tomorrow a bill which, unless it is enacted by tomorrow night, will in itself be a dead-letter law. For instance, the first paragraph of it amends section 3 (a) of the Draft Act. Naturally, if the Senate waits until day after tomorrow, or if it waits until tomorrow night after 12 midnight to pass this resolution which we send back, it in effect will then attempt to amend a law which has already gone off the statute books by its own limitations.

What does that mean? Take, for instance, the status of the draft boards. There are some 68,000 of them. The commissions issued to the members of the draft boards would automatically be dead. They will have to be reissued. Employees will have to be reemployed. The records which they have had, many of which are confidential under the draft law, become whose property? I do not know. Personally I have been very much against closing a great department of the Government such as the Selective Service System by simply letting it run out without providing for its orderly liquidation. Surely this organization has property which is worth protecting. Surely the records must be conserved and protected and put into the archives. Surely some provision ought to be made for the reemployment rights of its own employees, much less the reemployment rights of the veterans who have already come out of the service, and who will come out of the service in the next month or two.

Mr. Chairman, it might be said, "Well, we can pass another bill and take care of the reemployment rights of the veterans." But can you pass a law, Mr. Chairman, in such a case and make that law retroactive? What position will the employer take in the event 30 days from now we pass a resolution and say that "we hereby reinstate the reemployment rights of every veteran who has been discharged since the draft law went off the statute books"? Will he be compelled as a matter of law to reemploy a veteran when there is no law on the books requiring him to reemploy that veteran? Will he be compelled to say, "Yes, I will accept the law as retroactive and go back and reemploy the veteran, because the law subsequently passed attempts to make the reemployment rights effective back to an earlier date"?

So I say, Mr. Chairman, I think there are a number of very serious questions which will arise out of this amendment. I view this resolution as purely a stopgap resolution. I favored some of the amendments which were placed in the bill H. R. 6046, and some parts of the bill I did not favor. I supported the bill H. R. 6046, which was a House bill which we sent to the Senate. The Senate has its rules, and under its rules it did not get around to this bill which we sent to them, we all think in ample time. I think, Mr. Chairman, as a Member of the House, that we ourselves have been a little subject to criticism in this respect. We had 1 full year in which to take up and pass a bill extending selective service if it were the desire of the House of Representatives to take this action. We waited not until the last 6 months, not until the last 3 months of that year; we waited until the very last month of that year, and then we brought into the House a bill which this House debated for 4 or 5 hours of most vitriolic debate here on the floor of the House of Representatives, and finally sent to the Senate the bill H. R. 6046 as a completed measure.

Mr. Chairman, again I say I view this resolution only as a stopgap piece of legislation. I would not be in favor of it otherwise. I am afraid the entire Selective Service System will fall into the discard without this measure. I am afraid any amendments whatsoever attached to it will not be acted upon in time to prevent the original act itself from passing out of existence, and with it the right for reemployment of hundreds of thousands of our veterans. These are all matters requiring thought and consideration; and I do not think the Senate should rush through these matters any more than it should rush through other important legislation. Passage of this measure will give the Senate 6 weeks more time; and during this period many, if not all, of the salutary features of the House bill may be accepted by the Senate.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary for a Senate committee to hold long, extended hearings on this proposition. The House committee has already held those hearings. The measure was debated here in the House at length. We know what it is about.

My distinguished friend from Louisiana says the Senate will have to pass it in a day if we send it back. That is what the Senate is asking us to do in a day. The Senate can legislate as fast as we can.

For my part, I think we should pass a resolution, as we did before, to declare the war at an end. American boys have won this war, American ingenuity and American enterprise, and the American taxpayers have supplied the sinews of war. The American people want to get back down to earth and get back to business, and here we are with this resolution that will disturb the mothers and fathers and the young men who are trying to go through school today.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. KLEIN. The gentleman says that Americans of all kinds have won this war. Does that mean Americans of all religions, including Jews and colored people?

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from New York is the last man on earth who ought to ask that question. If he does not know, I am not going to begin to try to educate him.

I am for this amendment, and I think it should pass, and the Senate should accept it without reservation.

I will say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] that those Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians, and other white gentiles, the Communists in New York are attacking, shed their blood in this war. The God-fearing Christian men and women of this country sent their sons to fight and die in this conflict, and it is about time those alien-minded, as well as the foreign-born, atheistic Communists in New York stopped attacking them.

When we get through with this measure we ought to pass a deportation law to send those Reds back where they came from.

Why should we wait for Members of another body to get down out of the international stratosphere and get their feet on the ground, get some good old American dirt between their toes? Let us pass this amendment and send this resolution back to them as amended.

That meets the approval of the American people. The Senate will pass it almost unanimously with hardly a dissenting vote.

I remember we had this situation after the last war. They tried to continue the war indefinitely. We had some international moon gazers in those days. Some fellows thought we were going to find safety, happiness, and prosperity for our country beyond the seas, along the Thames, the Volga, or the Rhine. When as a matter of fact we are going to find safety for our country only in the strength of the American people.

A resolution was brought to the floor of the House in 1921, almost 3 years after the fighting ceased, to declare the other war at an end. It passed on a roll call by 307 to 61.

I have a resolution in now to declare this war at an end. If you vote down this amendment and continue the draft, you will continue to drag these teen-age boys out of school, and continue to disturb mothers and fathers of this Nation.

We have already passed a law to raise the pay of the members of the armed forces. If the Senate passes it, we will get all the men we need. Then we can

bring those boys home who desire to come.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. If we were to pass this amendment, would it not be similar to the bill which passed the House?

Mr. RANKIN. It would be the same bill.

Mr. GREEN. May I ask the gentleman how he voted on the bill which passed the House?

Mr. RANKIN. I voted for it.

I will ask the gentleman if he voted for it.

Mr. GREEN. I voted for it.

Mr. RANKIN. Then the gentleman agrees with me that we should adopt this amendment?

Mr. GREEN. No, I do not.

Mr. RANKIN. Then the gentleman has changed his mind?

Mr. GREEN. No, I have not changed my mind. I voted against some of the amendments, and I voted to send the bill to the Senate so it could be corrected.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. A lot of people want to keep this country in a state of war because they can make a lot of money.

Mr. RANKIN. The best thing we can do is to adopt this amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, during the month preceding the attack at Pearl Harbor, when we were attempting to provide some semblance of protection, we were asked frequently by the gentleman from Missouri to follow him. The gentleman from Missouri insisted that we did not need airplanes when it was perfectly apparent to everyone that sooner or later we would be attacked. The gentleman from Missouri contended that it was not necessary to have a draft law when everyone knew that there would not be volunteers in sufficient numbers in order to make our safety complete. The gentleman from Missouri opposed every step taken which was necessary to defend ourselves. Thank goodness, we did not follow the gentleman from Missouri. I trust we will not follow the gentleman from Missouri today.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I will be very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman has made some statements that are absolutely untrue. He says I stood in the well of the House long before Pearl Harbor and made certain statements. In a day or two I am going to quote from those speeches for the benefit of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further. I stated that the gentleman from Missouri contended we did not need an air force.

Mr. SHORT. I never contended that.

Mr. WALTER. He opposed that measure. He also opposed the draft bill.

Mr. SHORT. How many Democrats opposed it also?

Mr. WALTER. I do not care how many. Thank God I was not one of them. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

Mr. SHORT. You claim that every bill you recommended was for peace.

Mr. WALTER. If we had followed the gentleman from Missouri during that hour of dire peril, I know where we would be today. I would like to call the attention of the House to something I heard the Secretary of State say in testifying before the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee. Cordell Hull said that he always had the feeling when he was dealing with Nomura and the other Japanese diplomats that they were looking over his shoulder in order to see what he had behind the strong words that he was giving them. Bear this in mind; the shooting is over but the war is not over. We stand to lose all of those things that many of us fought for. We stand to lose today that which we lost after the last war, because we did as my friend from Mississippi boasts we did. We declared the war to be ended too quickly.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I decline to yield for the moment.

It seems to me that we ought to be practical about this matter. Let us place in the hands of our diplomats the only thing that the nations of this world understand. If they feel we are not going to back up our diplomats and statesmen, what are they going to think when we tell them what we expect them to do with respect to territory aggressions in this world? What will their attitude be when we insist on certain things being done? They will laugh at us, because they know we will do nothing but talk and carry toothpicks.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I went along and voted for every measure to support the war effort.

Mr. WALTER. Yes. Now I decline to yield further.

It seems to me that the least we can do is to keep the draft law alive. That is all the Senate resolution provides. Then we will have 45 days in which to write the kind of legislation that probably will be necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, the matter before us today is one which involves the national interest of our country and which is directly connected with the national safety of our country. I say those words deliberately.

As we sit here, elected by our constituents, charged with the responsibility of voting our conscience as legislators, not our fears, thinking of the future and not the next election, thinking of the years in the future, we see around the world many things happening which ought to cause us to pause and hesitate for a moment and reflect, and which ought to cause us to feel somewhat disturbed. We should realize the importance of continuing this law beyond midnight tomorrow night. I think it is pretty generally agreed by all Members, whether they agree on 18 years or 20 years for induction, that some kind of a selective service law should be extended for another year.

I am not going to get into a discussion of 20 years or 18 years on this occasion, but I am going to stress if I can the necessity of action before tomorrow night at 12 o'clock. I recognize that some Members might justifiably feel they should not be placed in this position, but the fact is that the situation exists, and the interest of the Nation calls for an extension of the Selective Service Act. The Senate has passed this resolution, and it is before us.

If any amendment is adopted to the resolution, as I see it, this means that the selective-service law on the statute books at the present time expires tomorrow night at 12 o'clock. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has ably and pointedly presented the reasons why this is so. It would be impossible to have any action taken by the other branch and certainly a conference committee by tomorrow; and, automatically, if this resolution is not passed without amendment the law expires tomorrow at midnight.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I wish to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that if we adopt this amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri the Senate will agree to it in less than an hour.

Mr. McCORMACK. I seldom agree with the gentleman from Mississippi——

Mr. RANKIN. I know that.

Mr. McCORMACK. And I must be frank in stating that this is one time I sharply disagree with him.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. When I had the disagreement with the gentleman from Mississippi I was a little uncertain as to how he voted. On the day we voted on this bill the gentleman from Mississippi voted "no" and then went down to the well and changed his vote to "yes."

Mr. RANKIN. I said I voted for the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let us not get into that.

Mr. GREEN. The gentleman asked me if I changed my vote. The gentleman changed his mind and vote the day we voted and should be the last one to question anyone on changing his mind.

Mr. RANKIN. A Member can always change his vote at the proper parliamentary stage. When I found I was in error, of course I changed my vote.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, in the crisis, in the situation that confronts us now, with tomorrow midnight the deadline, how twelve or eighteen million young men are going to feel who wore the uniform in actual wartime. We are considering extending in the national interest of the country until

July 1, because of the situation that exists legislatively, a law that is necessary in the national interest of our country, with a little over 100,000 involved, with 600,000 in uniform now who are under 20 years of age.

I hope the amendment and all amendments will be defeated.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take 5 minutes. I believe every man in the House knows how he is going to vote on this amendment and on the bill. I do not see any reason for delaying the vote, no matter who chooses to speak to us.

But I do feel that unless we adopt this resolution as it is, that it is the end of selective service. In the second place, if we adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri with the restrictions and limitations it carries selective service is dead.

So the issue is clear. I ask only one thing. Let us all be recorded. I want to be recorded so that I will be on the record of the family of every man who served in this war.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHORT) there were—ayes 124, noes 151.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. SPARKMAN and Mr. SHORT.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 128, noes 160.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHERIDAN: After line 5, insert the following: "Section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(3) After May 14, 1946, no individual who has a child or children shall be inducted without his consent for training and service under this act. As used in this paragraph the term "child" includes a child legally adopted, a stepchild, a foster child, and a person who is supported in good faith by the individual in a relationship similar to that of a parent and child, but such term does not include any person 18 years of age or over unless such person is physically or mentally handicapped.'"

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the amendment to prohibit the further induction of fathers and those who have children in the status of a child or a physically handicapped dependent.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERIDAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. I do not recall if the gentleman from Pennsylvania was present, but I am certain that General Eisenhower testified before the Committee on Military Affairs that no fathers are now being drafted and that he did not propose that any would be drafted.

Mr. SHERIDAN. But we are making that mandatory under the law with this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHERIDAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHERIDAN) there were ayes 132, noes 128.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed as tellers Mr. SPARKMAN and Mr. SHERIDAN.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 139, noes 127.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHERIDAN: After line 5, insert the following section:

"So much of the first sentence of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, as precedes the first proviso is amended to read as follows:

"'Section 3 (a). Except as otherwise provided in this act, every male citizen of the United States and every other male person residing in the United States who is between the ages of 20 and 30 at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 20 after having been required to register pursuant to section 2 of this act, shall be liable for training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States.'"

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment that was adopted in H. R. 6064, restricting the induction of the 18- and 19-year-old boys. It restricts future induction of those between the ages of 20 and 30.

I hope it is agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I want to call the attention of the Committee to the remarks that I formerly made in Committee of the Whole during general debate, when I stated that if we adopt amendments to this resolution we might as well count selective service as dead. We have just adopted one amendment in Committee of the Whole, on which I certainly hope we shall have an opportunity to go on record in the House. It is an amendment that simply provides that that shall not be done that is already carried into effect by regulation. Not a single father has been inducted since VJ-day, and the regulation is on the books today. Yet, by adding this amendment you have created a legislative situation that kills selective service. The vote that is put in the RECORD when the roll is called will determine whether or not you want to keep selective service alive in any shape whatsoever.

The present amendment seeks to eliminate the 18-and 19-year-old groups. We thrashed that out in the House when H. R. 6064 was under consideration. The House decided in favor of eliminating those age groups, and it is now in the bill that is pending in the Senate. But again, if we add that amendment here, we are simply killing selective service. We can laugh as much as we want to, but we all know the rules of the Senate. We know that whereas we operate under the 5-minute rule here, they do not. We know that it is impossible, upon the objection of a single Member of that body, to lay aside pending legislation and take up any matter such as this, to send it to conference or to agree to amendments. Therefore, we may reasonably expect that this resolution will not be taken up in the Senate on tomorrow and that no action will be taken on it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. In just a minute.

If that action is not taken, Selective Service is dead. I am not arguing as to the merits of changing the age limits. Personally, I am against it, simply because we do not have enough in the brackets between 20 and 30 to supply the needs of the armed forces over and above what is contemplated will be received from voluntary recruitment. I am not at the present time however arguing the merits of this question; I am arguing simply the legislative situation which is this: That if we adopt amendments to this resolution we might as well write it off the books because it will die at midnight tomorrow.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with my friend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] when he in effect says if you are against selective service and want to see it pass out of the picture tomorrow night at 12 o'clock, it is fine to vote for this amendment, as we did the amendment just adopted.

Referring to the last amendment, I may say that there is not a single man in this House who does not favor the exemption of fathers from further military service, but it should not be forgotten that that was an absolutely futile amendment, because General Eisenhower and the Selective Service have not only testified but the records will show that they are not drafting one single father, and do not intend to do so. I believe the record will show further that they have not drafted one father since VJ-day.

We have to be realistic about this thing, we have to be practical about it. I sent down this morning to the Selective Service Bureau and asked for figures on the men between 20 and 30 years of age. I hold in my hand an official statement from Selective Service in which they made the requested reports from their directors in every State of the eligible men between the ages of 20 and 30. This gives it by States. I do not of course have time to read it in detail, but it shows that the total number of men all over the United States between the ages of 20 and 30 is 71,860; and approximately 50 percent of these registrants would be found physically and mentally unacceptable to the military service. Surely we can let this thing ride until the Senate, whether right or wrong in having sent us this resolution, has a chance to consider the bill we sent them. It just means that Selective Service is absolutely dead if we add any kind of amendment to this resolution. For the security of our country and the future peace of the world, I do not believe we can take that gamble. It is not a pleasant task

but we must think of our country and its future above everything else. There will be great rejoicing in many parts of the world if Selective Service dies tomorrow night. I grant you we are confronted with an awkard and unusual parliamentary situation. I am no prophet and I can be mistaken, but it is my definite conviction that if this resolution is amended, then Selective Service is dead. I am not willing to take that chance.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I have on previous occasions seen this House ignominiously surrender, but I have never witnessed a more pusillanimous capitulation than we have seen here this afternoon. You would think that we were honor and duty bound, slavishly and blindly to follow another body in this Congress, that we must accept without equivocation or evasion, without any mental reservation, anything that some august, infallible, and omnipotent body may send over here.

We have been repeatedly told that by adopting these amendments we would kill selective service. No such thing is true. It is just as easy for the other body to accept a measure on which we have held exhaustive hearings and thorough debate as it is for this body cowardly to surrender and accept a resolution which that body passed in 5 minutes time. When, in the name of reason are Members of the House of Representatives going to stand up and defend their rights and protect the interests of their people?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Texas talked about the rules of the Senate. You ask any Senator over there and he will tell you they have only one rule and that is unanimous consent. They can pass this bill in 5 minutes if they desire to do so.

Mr. SHORT. I agree with my friend from Mississippi. I think they could do that. They demonstrate it often. They passed the present resolution in 5 minutes.

Before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, Senator JOHNSON asked General Eisenhower if these 18- and 19-year-old boys made good policemen. General Eisenhower said, "I do not think they do."

Is there any Member of this body so naive, so gullible or inexperienced as to believe these men are qualified to make good occupational troops? Many of our Members have visited foreign countries; we have seen these boys in those countires and we have talked to them here at home. There is not a city council in all America that would employ them for police service. We all know they do not possess the mature judgment or the wise discretion that older men possess.

In fact, General Eisenhower stated before the Senate committee that for occupational duty in foreign lands he did not believe an 18-year-old boy is as good as the 25-year-old. Yet we are asked to accept here at the eleventh hour a resolution from another body to extend the time for 6 weeks. Why? I repeat for the third time this afternoon, it is nothing more than a surreptitious attempt by sabotage, by subterfuge, to come here under false pretenses in order that 200,000 high-school graduates within the next 3 weeks might be inducted into our armed forces. The fathers and mothers do not want it and I do not even think the Army officers want it. I have talked with many Army officers who fought on both the Pacific and the European fronts, and they will tell you in private conversation that the loss of morale as well as of morals among the young men in our armies abroad have injured them more than even the enemy did during the war itself.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely and earnestly hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be adopted.

Again, if Members of this body will take the figures of the Army itself they will find that the draft is no longer needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, the pending amendment was the main part of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] which the Committee of the Whole defeated a short while ago. I hope we will not respond to some high-sounding phrases and an appeal to the emotional mind with reference to another body, august or otherwise, as indulged in by the gentleman from Missouri. The fact remains that Selective Service expires tomorrow night at midnight. That is an indisputable fact that we cannot escape. We might like to laugh it off, we might like to forget it, but time passes, and it is only a matter of a few hours until midnight tomorrow night arrives.

I am not going to discuss the last amendment because apparently it is being complied with by the War Department at the present time. I do urge the Committee of the Whole to defeat this amendment because if it is adopted I fear the situation will be such that we will not be able to get through legislation extending the selective-service law.

I am trying to appeal to reason and not to emotion. I am not criticizing the action taken on the last amendment. I do say that this amendment, if adopted, in my opinion, will be a harmful one. I do say that when you voted down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri a short while ago, that the main part of it, the body of it, was the amendment that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has offered.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE].

Mrs. LUCE. The gentleman from Missouri made the most astonishing accusation that I have ever heard made on the floor of this House which was to the effect that the leaders of our armed services are bent on sabotaging this country. It was my impression that General Eisenhower and our other military leaders are bent on protecting our country and safeguarding it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Pardon me. I might say, and I think the rest all agree, that they were bent on saving our country during the war. I quite agree with the gentlewoman on her observation after the war.

Mrs. LUCE. Will the gentleman be kind enough to explain the effect that the sabotaging of this resolution may have on the forthcoming peace conference? I gather that all the nations expect to meet in June, in Paris, and that one of the things that will be most effective toward securing just and lasting peace treaties is their knowledge that America is intent on keeping herself so strong and armed that she can prevent any other kind of peace treaties.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the observation made by the gentlewoman herself is the best answer. I said in my previous remarks that I tried to convey some disturbing thoughts. We see over the horizon something coming. All right. Democracy is involved. We have got to have a dynamic democracy. We have got to have a militant democracy. We have got to have a strong democracy and we have got to have our country in a position where it can, in its own national interest, meet any crisis that might develop, and particularly in relation to laying a firm foundation for lasting peace.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. According to the prediction made this afternoon, and the Senate should agree to it, then selective service could begin drafting from the 50,000 pool that they admit they have between 20 and 30, and in the meantime, between now and July 1, this matter could be determined so that the other body can make up its mind about the 18- and 19-year-old boys, could they not?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is offering a hope. This is the main amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri which we defeated, and I say if this amendment is adopted, the chance of an extension going through will be impaired.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first time in many weeks that I have taken the well of this House to speak. I have been in constant attendance, however, listening to the arguments on proposals that have been made, and especially those made here today. I cannot conscientiously vote for any proposal that I believe will have the effect of destroying the Selective Service. However, I do not share many of the apprehensions that have been expressed this afternoon by some of the distinguished gentlemen who have spoken in opposition to the two amendments that have been proposed. I think we all lose sight of the fact that the matter which is before us is a simple resolution which extends the Selective Service Act until July 1, 1946.

Really, what we have before us is this. This body has gone on record overwhelmingly against the drafting of fathers and against the drafting of 18- and 19-year-old boys. Is not that true? Just a short time ago we so voted together with other things as amendments to existing law and sent it to the other body for action. For some reason they have not acted. They then passed this simple little extending resolution. They have our bill before them. They say, "We want until the 1st of July in order to act on your bill." What the House proposes doing is simply this—extend Selective Service until July 1, 1942, but in the meantime, between now and July 1, 1946, you shall not draft these 18- and 19-year-old boys and you sh'ant draft any fathers." Is not that what it amounts to?

Then the majority leader comes before us and says, "Oh, no; it is not proper for you to ask the Senate to do that, because the Senate has told us if we put any amendment on this resolution it will not have time to give it consideration before 12 o'clock tomorrow night, and, therefore, because it will refuse to consider the resolution passed by this House, selective service will die."

I cannot believe from my experience with Members of the United States Senate and from my contact with the Democratic leadership in the United States Senate that they are going to permit selective service to die by midnight tomorrow night. So the very worst that can be expected, if you adopt these amendments that have been suggested, is that they will be in the law until July 1, 1946. That is all. In the meantime, the Senate will have an opportunity to pass upon the bill which the House has sent over and have a conference, and then we will have an opportunity to reach an agreement in the ordinary legislative way.

If I thought for one moment that the adoption of an amendment to this resolution would kill selective service, I would certainly vote against it, but it does seem to me, in view of the universal demand on the part of the people of this country that we stop the drafting of 18- and 19-year-olds, that we can afford to put this amendment in with assurance that the Senate will accept it for the period that we know ends July 1.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I was surprised to hear members on this floor express a lack of confidence in the Senate of the United States. I was surprised to hear my majority leader pound on this board and say that if we adopt this amendment the Senate would not act.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I said I fear for action.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. The gentleman expresses fear of the United States Senate. I do not have any such fear. The Senate of the United States is just as much interested in America and American boys as we are.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. The last CONGRESSIONAL RECORD we have here is Friday's, May 10. The other body was not in session on Saturday, and they knew this was coming up today.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly.

If we adopt these amendments, and they ought to be adopted, it is absolute nonsense to be dragging fathers of children from their homes and teen-age boys out of high school at this time; as I said, if we adopt them, the Senate will either approve them or pass the bill we sent them.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield.

Mrs. LUCE. I also have the greatest of confidence in the Senate of the United States as a whole, but I was given to understand that one dissident vote in the Senate could stall this legislation indefinitely.

Mr. RANKIN. I have the same confidence in the Senate of the United States that the Senate of the United States has in the House of Representatives. They took it for granted that we could pass this measure in a day, and I take it for granted they could do the same thing.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mrs. LUCE. Is it or is it not true that one Senator tomorrow could stall this legislation? That is the technical question I am putting.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not think so. I have seen the Senate operate. I will say to the lady from Connecticut that there has never been a legislative body on the face of the earth that could expedite legislation more rapidly than the Senate of the United States. Look how quickly they sent this measure over here to us. I have confidence in the Senate. I do not even entertain the fears of my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. When we send this measure back to the Senate, they will either accept these amendments or they will do the wise thing and just say, "Oh, well, let us pass the House bill and be done with it." That is what they should do.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Does not the gentleman from Mississippi seriously fear that if we continue to draft 18- and 19-year-old boys, taking them out of high schools and colleges, this Nation in a few years will wake up with an acute shortage of doctors, dentists, technicians, and technologists, and other scientificially trained men?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; not only that, but you are injuring the morale of these boys when you drag them out of college.

The feeling in the mind of the average American today is that Europe is in a worse mess now than it ever was before in all its history, and that Asia is in a worse mess.

Somebody said that this measure would disturb the peace conference. Are we going to have a peace conference? If so, it is about time we had it. It is about time we signed some treaties of peace. After we have taken Germany's arms away, and have taken her navy away, and have destroyed her air force, and have torn down all the factories that could manufacture weapons of war and after we have taken everything that Japan had, "in the name of all the gods at once" are you going to draft teen-age boys and fathers of children and send them throughout the world for a generation to come?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. With regard to the matter of stripping our schools and the effect that that would have on education over the years to come, is it not quite well known that schools and colleges throughout the country are having to turn away our war veterans because they cannot find the facilities so that they may go to school?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; the boys we took before are coming back and trying to complete their education. The one we would take away now would probably be deprived of that opportunity.

I hope the amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the members of the committee will permit me to speak quite frankly as a physician—and I mean frankly. The last report I saw from the army of occupation in Germany and Japan showed something like 400 boys to the thousand have contracted veneral disease. Now, let us call it by its right name—it is syphilis and gonorrhea. That record is appalling. In some places the military had houses of prostitution under license and supervision. Members of this Congress, how many of your constituents want their 18- and 19-year-old boys sent into areas where morals are so loose, where prostitution and venereal disease has such a record?

As long as the Army has the type of morals that it apparently has, it is certainly an awful act to send 18- and 19-year-old boys into such foul and nasty conditions. These boys are young, inexperienced, and do not know how to cope with these immoral situations.

When I was State health director in Nebraska we had at one time a rate of 61 cases of venereal disease per thousand in a neighboring city, and that was the all-time high among the enlisted personnel at that time. Thirty-one to the thousand. The present venereal disease rate in the Army has reached an all time high.

I say to you it is a serious thing to take these teen-age boys and send them into conditions of that kind. This House last month said very definitely they did not want to draft 18- and 19-year-old boys. We should stay by that decision. It is difficult for me to walk up the hill and then walk down again. Let us reaffirm our position in this resolution.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is it not a fact that the farms of this country have been stripped of manpower, and that many of them will be unable to operate if they

take these 18- and 19-year-old boys into the Army at this time?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is true. Of course, the draft boards, through the insistence of the Selective Service Administration in Washington, have not followed the Tydings amendment which this House passed and which the Senate passed. We reaffirmed our conviction in the Tydings amendment. It has not been followed. They have taken the boys off the farms when they did not have suitable replacements of experienced farm help. But the most serious thing, as I see it, is the morals that exist presently in the Army. The boys of 18 and 19 years old are not good policemen. They should stay in school.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHERIDAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SPARKMAN) there were—ayes 176, noes 119.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a third amendment which is at the desk but I wish to withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws his amendment.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ARENDS: Insert a new section as follows:

"Section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

" 'In carrying out the provisions of this subsection the local selective-service board in classifying the registrant shall base its findings solely and exclusively on whether the registrant is necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor.' "

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, there is no use taking further time on this amendment. It is already incorporated in the bill the House has passed, H. R. 6064. It speaks for itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ARENDS) there were—ayes 97, noes 165.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure everybody knows what the situation is. I am not here to tell anybody how to vote because this is still a free country and everyone votes as he thinks best. But I think that we certainly ought to be realistic about this thing at the present time.

The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] said in his opening statement that he had consulted with the majority leader of the Senate who said it was impossible for the Senate to take up this bill including these various amendments before 12 o'clock tomorrow night. It is all right to criticize the other body, if you want to, but there are some able and patriotic men over there. Some lost sons in this war and they have the same interest that we do in the welfare of the Nation.

It is my conviction that if these amendments are adopted tonight by this body and the resolution goes back to the Senate with these amendments, we might just as well sound the death knell for selective service. I know how a lot of you feel and I appreciate the rejoicing it will bring in some parts of the world. We are heading back to the old days of isolation. I am not willing to travel that road.

Peace has not yet been won. Our Secretary of State and two distinguished Senators, one from Texas and one from Michigan, are at this very moment in a conference room in Paris trying to work out the situation so that we will not have to go through this thing again, so that our children and grandchildren will not have to go through another war 25 years from now. While we want to be on peaceful terms with every nation in the world, yet I have in mind one nation that already has a standing army of 6,000,000 men with compulsory universal military service, not training. I know of the trouble in China, in Manchuria, at Trieste, and a lot of other places throughout the world. I read the articles of Mr. Walter Lippmann last week as to what is going on in Europe. We have made little progress in teaching democracy to Germany. There is but one thing some people in the world understand and respect, and that is military strength.

Mr. Chairman, we have demobilized our Army, Navy, and Air Corps of 13,000,000 men to two and a half million men. Ask General Eisenhower about it. He led us to a great victory. He has been before our committee to give us warning as to what the situation is today in world affairs.

Mr. Chairman, nobody is going to be fooled about this thing. There are some fathers and mothers who do not want their boys to go into the service for awhile, but I know a lot of boys the service has not hurt. I am thinking about the peace and security of the world, especially for the next 12 months.

Mr. Chairman, when we get back into the House I am one of those, and I am sure there are others, who will insist that we get a record vote on these amendments.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. LUCE. What will it profit the mothers of the United States to know that their sons can now continue to learn that 2,500 years ago all Gaul was divided into three parts and that today the world is split into two warring factions?

Mr. THOMASON. We are living in a sick and chaotic world. I am sorry we do not have peace, I am sorry we cannot officially declare the war at an end; but you cannot have a world war like that we just went through and not have serious repercussions and disturbances. Our envoys are meeting at different places all over the world trying to fix it so that the next generation will not have to go through with this thing again and so that we will not drift back into that spirit of isolationism that we had a few years ago. I hope you will not adopt a single one of these amendments. This is no time to think of elections. This is the hour to place the welfare of our country above everything else. Some of you talk long and loud about the danger of communism, and yet you now vote to reduce our Army to one of the smallest and weakest of any of the big nations of the world. You make impotent the efforts of our delegates around the peace table. Surely we can wait a few months until we know what the situation is and whether or not we can work out an enduring peace. I beg of you not to vote for these amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, when H. R. 6064, the bill to extend the Selective Service Act was before us a month ago, I voted for these amendments being offered today, namely, to exempt fathers and boys under 20 years of age. The Army admitted what we all know, that most boys of 18 and 19 years of age are wholly unsuited for occupation or policeman duties, that deterioration of morale and of morals is exceedingly alarming among them, and that it would prefer to have volunteers. Its figures did not prove it would need to draft any such lads, at least during this year. The reasons for not inducting them are so very strong and compelling that I could not vote to draft them until at least an honest-to-goodness attempt had been made to get an adequate number of men by volunteering.

If that were the issue here today, I would vote the same way. But the issue here today is simply whether we will agree to extend the selective-service law for 6 weeks until the Senate can get around to considering our bill, and in what form it will extend the draft.

I do not see how one can look at our world today and vote to destroy the selective-service machinery entirely, including the right to their former jobs of some 2,000,000 men still in the service. If we reject these amendments and vote for the resolution, it goes at once to the President and it is certain the draft will be extended for 6 weeks and their rights secured. If we vote for the amendments the resolution must go back to the Senate and be accepted there before tomorrow night or selective service expires. No one can predict whether or not the Senate would accept the amendments. I hope it would, but if it did not, the situation would be confused beyond words. It would not satisfy my conscience just to be able to say the confusion is the Senate's fault. I do not want the confusion and the danger to our national safety which such a situation would involve. The only way to be sure of avoiding it is to vote against the amendments, no matter how strongly I approve their purposes, and then vote for the resolution to extend the present law until July 1. When the Senate acts during the next 6 weeks and the bill to extend the draft beyond that date comes before us, I expect to vote, as previously, to exempt fathers and 18- and 19-year-olds, unless, God forbid, the international picture should greatly darken and the volun-

teering program fail miserably, which I am confident it will not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the joint resolution back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the joint resolution as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 159) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until July 1, 1946, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the joint resolution as amended do pass.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them engross.

The question is on the amendments.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONDERO. Do I understand that we are now voting on both amendments?

The SPEAKER. We are voting on the amendments engross. No request was made for separate consideration.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be again reported.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHERIDAN: After line 5, insert the following:

"Section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(3) After May 14, 1946, no individual who has a child or children shall be inducted without his consent for training and service under this act. As used in this paragraph the term "child" includes a child legally adopted, a stepchild, a foster child, and a person who is supported in good faith by the individual in a relationship similar to that of a parent and child but such term does not include any person 18 years of age or over unless such person is physically or mentally handicapped.'"

Amendment offered by Mr. SHERIDAN: Add a new section after line 5 reading as follows:

"That so much of the first sentence of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, as precedes the first proviso is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 3. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of 20 and 30, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 20 after having been required to register pursuant to section 2 of this act, shall be liable for training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendments.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 213, nays 154, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]

YEAS—213

Abernethy	Gillette	Morrison
Allen, Ill.	Gillie	Murray, Wis.
Andersen, H. Carl	Goodwin	Neely
Anderson, Calif.	Gordon	O'Brien, Mich.
Andresen, August H.	Gorski	O'Hara
Angell	Gossett	O'Konski
Arends	Graham	Outland
Arnold	Granahan	Peterson, Fla.
Barden	Granger	Peterson, Ga.
Barrett, Pa.	Grant, Ind.	Pfeifer
Barrett, Wyo.	Griffiths	Philbin
Beall	Gross	Phillips
Bennett, Mo.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Pittenger
Biemiller	Gwynne, Iowa	Ploeser
Bishop	Hagen	Powell
Blackney	Halleck	Price, Fla.
Boykin	Harness, Ind.	Quinn, N. Y.
Bradley, Mich.	Havenner	Rabaut
Bradley, Pa.	Hébert	Ramey
Brehm	Heffernan	Randolph
Brown, Ga.	Hendricks	Rankin
Brown, Ohio	Henry	Reed, Ill.
Brumbaugh	Hill	Reed, N. Y.
Buffett	Hoch	Rees, Kans.
Butler	Hoeven	Resa
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoffman	Rich
Camp	Holmes, Mass.	Riley
Campbell	Holmes, Wash.	Rizley
Cannon, Mo.	Hook	Robsion, Ky.
Carlson	Howell	Rockwell
Chenoweth	Hull	Roe, Md.
Chiperfield	Izac	Rogers, Fla.
Church	Jenkins	Rogers, N. Y.
Clevenger	Jennings	Rooney
Clippinger	Jensen	Rowan
Coffee	Johnson, Ill.	Sabath
Cole, Mo.	Johnson, Okla.	Sadowski
Colmer	Jones	Savage
Cox	Jonkman	Schwabe, Mo.
Cravens	Kee	Schwabe, Okla.
Crawford	Keefe	Sharp
Crosser	Kelley, Pa.	Sheridan
Cunningham	Kelly, Ill.	Short
Curtis	Kerr	Simpson, Ill.
Dirksen	Kinzer	Smith, Ohio
Dolliver	Knutson	Smith, Wis.
Dondero	Landis	Springer
Doughton, N. C.	Lane	Stefan
Doyle	Larcade	Stevenson
Dworshak	LeFevre	Stockman
Earthman	Lemke	Sumner, Ill.
Elliott	Lewis	Talbot
Ellis	Ludlow	Talle
Ellsworth	Lynch	Tarver
Engel, Mich.	McCowen	Thom
Feighan	McDonough	Thomas, Tex.
Fellows	McGehee	Tibbott
Fenton	McGlinchey	Torrens
Fernandez	McGregor	Vinson
Fisher	McKenzie	Voorhis, Calif.
Flannagan	McMillan, S. C.	Vursell
Flood	McMillen, Ill.	Welchel
Fogarty	Madden	West
Fuller	Mansfield, Mont.	Whitten
Gardner	Marcantonio	Whittington
Gathings	Martin, Iowa	Wickersham
Gerlach	Martin, Mass.	Wilson
Gibson	Mason	Winstead
Gifford	Michener	Winter
Gillespie	Miller, Nebr.	Wolverton, N. J.
	Mills	Wood
		Woodruff

NAYS—154

Adams	Bloom	Case, S. Dak.
Almond	Bolton	Celler
Andrews, Ala.	Brooks	Chapman
Andrews, N. Y.	Bryson	Chelf
Auchincloss	Buck	Clason
Barry	Bulwinkle	Clements
Bates, Ky.	Bunker	Cole, Kans.
Bates, Mass.	Byrne, N. Y.	Cole, N. Y.
Beckworth	Canfield	Combs
Bell	Carnahan	Cooley
Bland	Case, N. J.	Cooper
D'Alesandro	Holifield	Plumley
Davis	Hope	Poage
Delaney, James J.	Huber	Price, Ill.
Delaney, John J.	Jackson	Priest
D'Ewart	Johnson, Calif.	Rabin
Domengeaux	Johnson, Luther A.	Rains
Douglas, Calif.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rayfiel
Douglas, Ill.	Judd	Richards
Drewry	Kean	Rivers
Durham	Kearney	Robertson, Va.
Eberharter	Kefauver	Robinson, Utah
Elsaesser	Kilburn	Rogers, Mass.
Elston	Kilday	Ryter
Ervin	King	Sasscer
Fallon	Klein	Scrivner
Forand	Kunkel	Shafer
Fulton	Latham	Sikes
Gallagher	LeCompte	Simpson, Pa.
Gamble	Lesinski	Slaughter
Gary	Link	Smith, Maine
Gavin	Luce	Smith, Va.
Geelan	McConnell	Somers, N. Y.
Gore	McCormack	Sparkman
Grant, Ala.	Mahon	Spence
Green	Maloney	Starkey
Gregory	Manasco	Sullivan
Hale	Mankin	Sumners, Tex.
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mathews	Sundstrom
Hall, Leonard W.	May	Taber
Hancock	Miller, Calif.	Taylor
Harless, Ariz.	Murdock	Thomas, N. J.
Harris	Murphy	Thomason
Hays	Murray, Tenn.	Trimble
Healy	Norblad	Vorys, Ohio
Hedrick	Norrell	Wadsworth
Herter	O'Brien, Ill.	Walter
Heselton	O'Neal	Weaver
Hess	O'Toole	Wigglesworth
Hobbs	Pace	Woodhouse
	Patman	Worley
	Pickett	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—63

Allen, La.	Folger	Norton
Bailey	Gearhart	Patrick
Baldwin, Md.	Hand	Patterson
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hare	Reece, Tenn.
Bender	Hart	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bennet, N. Y.	Hartley	Rodgers, Pa.
Bonner	Hinshaw	Roe, N. Y.
Boren	Horan	Russell
Buckley	Jarman	Sheppard
Burch	Johnson, Ind.	Stewart
Cannon, Fla.	Keogh	Stigler
Clark	Kirwan	Tolan
Cochran	Kopplemann	Towe
Corbett	LaFollette	Traynor
Courtney	Lanham	Wasielewski
Curley	Lea	Welch
Daughton, Va.	Lyle	White
Dawson	Mansfield, Tex.	Wolcott
De Lacy	Merrow	Wolfenden, Pa.
Dingell	Monroney	
Eaton	Morgan	
Engle, Calif.	Mundt	

So the amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Mundt for, with Mr. Bennet of New York against.

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Lyle against.

Mr. Bender for, with Mr. Baldwin of New York against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Roe of New York against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Folger with Mr. Horan.

Mr. Boren with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Hare with Mr. Towe.

Mr. Bailey with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Hand.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.

Mr. Lanham with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. De Lacy with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Monroney with Mr. Gearhart.

Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Kopplemann with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.

Mr. White with Mr. LaFollette.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 280, nays 84, not voting 66, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

YEAS—280

Abernethy	Fallon	Kerr
Adams	Fellows	Kilburn
Allen, La.	Fenton	Kilday
Almond	Fernandez	Klein
Anderson, Calif.	Fisher	Kunkel
Andrews, Ala.	Flannagan	Larcade
Andrews, N. Y.	Fogarty	Latham
Angell	Forand	LeCompte
Arends	Fuller	LeFevre
Auchincloss	Fulton	Lesinski
Barrett, Pa.	Gallagher	Lewis
Barrett, Wyo.	Gamble	Link
Bates, Ky.	Gardner	Luce
Bates, Mass.	Gary	Lynch
Beckworth	Gathings	McConnell
Bell	Gavin	McGehee
Blackney	Greelan	McGlinchey
Bland	Gerlach	McKenzie
Bloom	Gibson	McMillan, S. C.
Bolton	Gifford	McMillen, Ill.
Boykin	Gillette	Madden
Bradley, Pa.	Gillie	Mahon
Brooks	Gore	Maloney
Brown, Ga.	Gorski	Manasco
Brumbaugh	Gossett	Mankin
Bryson	Graham	Martin, Mass.
Buck	Granahan	Mathews
Bulwinkle	Grant, Ala.	May
Bunker	Green	Michener
Butler	Gregory	Miller, Calif.
Byrne, N. Y.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Mills
Byrnes, Wis.	Hale	Morrison
Camp	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Murdock
Campbell	Hall, Leonard W.	Murphy
Canfield	Halleck	Murray, Tenn.
Cannon, Mo.	Hancock	Neely
Carlson	Harless, Ariz.	Norblad
Carnahan	Harness, Ind.	Norrell
Case, N. J.	Harris	O'Brien, Ill.
Case, S. Dak.	Havenner	O'Brien, Mich.
Celler	Hays	O'Neal
Chapman	Hébert	O'Toole
Chelf	Hedrick	Outland
Clason	Heffernan	Pace
Clements	Hendricks	Patman
Cole, Kans.	Herter	Peterson, Fla.
Cole, N. Y.	Heselton	Peterson, Ga.
Colmer	Hess	Pfeifer
Combs	Hill	Phillips
Cooley	Hobbs	Pickett
Cooper	Hoch	Ploeser
Cox	Hoeven	Poage
Cravens	Holmes, Mass.	Price, Fla.
Curtis	Holmes, Wash.	Price, Ill.
D'Alesandro	Hope	Priest
Davis	Howell	Quinn, N. Y.
Delaney, James J.	Huber	Rabaut
Delaney, John J.	Izac	Rabin
D'Ewart	Jackson	Rains
Domengeaux	Jenkins	Randolph
Dondero	Jennings	Rankin
Doughton, N. C.	Johnson, Calif.	Rayfiel
Douglas, Calif.	Johnson, Luther A.	Reed, Ill.
Douglas, Ill.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rees, Kans.
Doyle	Johnson, Okla.	Resa
Drewry	Jonkman	Rich
Durham	Judd	Richards
Earthman	Kean	Riley
Eberharter	Kearney	Rivers
Elliott	Kee	Rizley
Ellis	Keefe	Robertson, Va.
Ellsworth	Kefauver	Robinson, Utah
Elsaesser	Kelley, Pa.	Robsion, Ky.
Elston	Kelly, Ill.	Roe, Md.
Engel, Mich.	Kerr	Rogers, Fla.
Ervin	Kilburn	Rogers, Mass.
Rowan	Starkey	Rogers, N. Y.
Ryter	Sullivan	Rooney
Sabath	Sumners, Tex.	Vursell
Sasscer	Sundstrom	Wadsworth
Scrivner	Taber	Walter
Shafer	Talbot	Weaver
Sharp	Tarver	West
Sheridan	Taylor	Whitten
Sikes	Thom	Whittington
Simpson, Ill.	Thomas, N. J.	Wickersham
Simpson, Pa.	Thomas, Tex.	Wigglesworth
Slaughter	Thomason	Winstead
Smith, Maine	Tibbott	Wolverton, N. J.
Smith, Va.	Torrens	Wood
Somers, N. Y.	Trimble	Woodhouse
Sparkman	Vinson	Woodruff
Spence	Voorhis, Calif.	Worley
Springer	Vorys, Ohio	Zimmerman

NAYS—84

Allen, Ill.	Goodwin	Martin, Iowa
Andersen, H. Carl	Gordon	Mason
Andresen, August H.	Granger	Miller, Nebr.
Arnold	Grant, Ind.	Murray, Wis.
Barden	Griffiths	O'Hara
Beall	Gross	O'Konski
Bennett, Mo.	Gwynne, Iowa	Philbin
Biemiller	Hagen	Pittenger
Bishop	Healy	Plumley
Bradley, Mich.	Henry	Powell
Brehm	Hoffman	Ramey
Brown, Ohio	Holifield	Reed, N. Y.
Buffett	Hook	Rockwell
Chenoweth	Hull	Sadowski
Chiperfield	Jensen	Savage
Church	Johnson, Ill.	Schwabe, Mo.
Clevenger	Jones	Schwabe, Okla.
Clippinger	King	Short
Coffee	Kinzer	Smith, Ohio
Cole, Mo.	Knutson	Smith, Wis.
Crawford	Landis	Stefan
Crosser	Lane	Stevenson
Cunningham	Lemke	Stockman
Dolliver	Ludlow	Sumner, Ill.
Dworshak	McCowen	Talle
Feighan	McDonough	Weichel
Flood	McGregor	Wilson
Gillespie	Mansfield, Mont.	
	Marcantonio	

NOT VOTING—66

Bailey	Folger	Norton
Baldwin, Md.	Gearhart	Patrick
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hand	Patterson
Barry	Hare	Reece, Tenn.
Bender	Hart	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bennet, N. Y.	Hartley	Rodgers, Pa.
Bonner	Hinshaw	Roe, N. Y.
Boren	Horan	Russell
Buckley	Jarman	Sheppard
Burch	Johnson, Ind.	Stewart
Cannon, Fla.	Keogh	Stigler
Clark	Kirwan	Tolan
Cochran	Kopplemann	Towe
Corbett	LaFollette	Traynor
Courtney	Lanham	Wasielewski
Curley	Lea	Welch
Daughton, Va.	Lyle	White
Dawson	McCormack	Winter
De Lacy	Mansfield, Tex.	Wolcott
Dingell	Merrow	Wolfenden, Pa.
Dirksen	Monroney	
Eaton	Morgan	
Engle, Calif.	Mundt	

So the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Mundt for, with Mr. Bender against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. De Lacy against.

Mr. Kopplemann for, with Mr. Patterson against.

Mr. Roe of New York for, with Mr. White against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Barry with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Courtney with Mr. Dirksen.

Mr. Daughton of Virginia with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Engle of California with Mr. Bennet of New York.

Mr. Stigler with Mr. Horan.

Mr. Burch with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Stewart with Mr. Hand.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, on roll call 113 of Friday, May 10, I am recorded as absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask uannmous consent that the RECORD and Journal may be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the RECORD and Journal will be corrected accordingly.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION of REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement of policy by the UAW–CIO.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a report he made to his constituents.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Westbrook Pegler.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two places, one immediately following the other, and in each to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to include in the remarks he made certain tables.

Mr. ROWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects.

Mr. THOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Roger Babson.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. STIGLER, from May 14 to May 21, 1946, to attend graduation exercises of his daughter.

To Mr. HORAN (at the request of Mr. AREDNDS), for today.

To Mr. LANHAM (at the request of Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON) for today, on account of important business.

DIGEST OF
CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Legislative Reports and Service Section
(For Department staff only)

Issued May 15, 1946
For actions of May 14, 1946
79th-2nd, No. 90

CONTENTS

Airports.....22	Forestry.....20,22	Price control.....20
Appropriations....1,7,8,15	Grain.....4,21	Property requisition.....6
Congressional reorganization.13	Labor, farm.....10,19	Relief, foreign.....4,8,17
Corn.....21	Lend-lease..... 8	Roads.....10
Credit unions..... 5	Loans, farm.....18	Selective service.....10,11
Education..... 1	Marketing..... 2	Trade-marks..... 9
Food.....21	Parity.....16	Veterans.....11
Food shortages..... 3	Plant quarantine.....12	Wheat.....10,18,21

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate agreed to conference report on 2nd deficiency appropriation bill, which includes items for insect and plant-disease control, forest recreational areas, water facilities, and recentralization of FCA; ready for President. Senate agreed to conference report on 2nd appropriation rescission bill, which includes Hawaii-relief item; ready for President. Senate agreed to House amendments to new selective-service extension measure; ready for President. House committee reported bill to make various amendments to Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act. House provided $10,000 more for Food Shortages Committee.

HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Received from the President an amendment to the 1947 Budget for the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, providing $1,337,000, this amount, together with $280,900 made available to this Department, to be used for making payments to the States to cover costs of education of the public in food conservation in order to promote the production and preservation of food during the present emergency (H. Doc. 590)(p. 5126).

   Continued debate on H. R. 6335, the Interior appropriation bill, discussing provisions regarding reclamation, electrification, etc. (pp. 5104-25).

   Received from the President appropriation estimates for payment of claims for damages to private property (H. Doc. 592)(p. 5126).

   The Appropriations Committee reported the Coast Guard appropriation bill, H. R. 6428 (H. Rept. 2038)(p. 5093) and the legislative appropriation bill, H. R. 6429 (H. Rept. 2040)(p. 5104).

2. MARKETING AGREEMENTS. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 6303, to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act (H. Rept. 2051)(p. 5126).

3. FOOD SHORTAGES. Agreed without amendment to H. Res. 619, to provide $10,000 additional for the Special Committee Investigating Food Shortages (p. 5093); this resolution had been reported earlier in the day by the Accounts Committee (H. Rept. 2035)(p. 5126).

4. FOREIGN RELIEF. Received a petition from various N. Y. and Md. citizens recommending legislation to prohibit use of grain for beverages during the world food shortage (p. 5127).

   Received a Council of American Academy of Arts and Sciences petition for return to food rationing to make food available for foreign relief (p. 5127).

5. CREDIT UNIONS. The Banking and Currency Committee reported without amendment H. R. 6372, to amend the Federal Credit Union Act so as to provide penalties for over-charging of interest, permit issuance of shares in joint tenancy, give the boards more latitude regarding bonds of officers, liberalize the limitation on amount of loans, etc. (H. Rept. 2054)(p. 5126).

6. PROPERTY REQUISITION. Both Houses received from the President the CPA report on operations under the Property Requisitioning Act from Oct. 16, 1945, through April 15, 1946. To Military Affairs Committees. (pp. 5104, 5063.)

SENATE

7. SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H.R. 5890 (p. 5066). Agreed to the House amendment restricting to materials the authorization for reimbursable aid by departments and agencies to UNO. For provisions of the bill see Digests 81 and 86. This bill will now be sent to the President.

8. SECOND SURPLUS APPROPRIATION RESCISSION BILL. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H.R. 5604 (pp. 4065-6). Agreed to the House amendment to transfer $135,000,000 of lend-lease funds to UNRRA. For provisions of the bill see Digests 81 and 87. This bill will now be sent to the President.

9. TRADE-MARKS. The Patents Committee reported with amendments H.R. 1654, to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce and to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions (S.Rept. 1333) (p.5064).

10. SELECTIVE SERVICE. Agreed to the House amendments to S. J. Res. 159, to continue the Selective Training and Service Act until July 1, 1946 (pp. 5066-90). As finally passed the measure prohibits the induction of fathers and permits the induction of only those persons between the ages of 20 and 30. Approved by the President May 14, 1946.

During the debate Sen. Langer, R.Dak., criticized the induction of boys needed on farms (p. 5086) and stated that much of the available wheat had not been delivered to markets because of poor farm-to-market-roads (pp. 5081-2).

BILLS INTRODUCED

11. SELECTIVE SERVICE; VETERANS. S. 2193, by Sen. Wheeler, Mont., to grant to personnel in the military or naval forces certain benefits with respect to accumulated leave. To Military Affairs Committee. Remarks of author. (p. 5064.)

12. PLANT QUARANTINE. H.R. 6433, by Rep. Flannagan, Va., "to amend the Plant Quarantine Act." To Agriculture Committee. (p. 5126.)

13. CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION. S. 2177 (see Digest 89) to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government, embodies, in general, the recommendations made by the Joint Committee on Organization of Congress in its report of March 4, 1946 (for a detailed summary of the recommendations see Digest 37).

Sens. LaFollette, Thomas (Utah), Pepper, Russell, White, and Brooks comprise the Senate Special Reorganization of Congress Committee to which the bill was referred.

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

14. ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY. Sen. Langer, R.Dak., inserted a Mobile (Ala) Register article opposing this project (pp. A2807-8).

DEVELOPMENT OF THE ST. LAWRENCE RIVER—EDITORIAL FROM MOBILE (ALA.) REGISTER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Register Replies to Senator's Challenge on St. Lawrence Seaway," from the Register of Mobile, Ala., issue of May 2, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEARNING TO LIVE TOGETHER

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD quotations from the program on the occasion of a dinner given in honor of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, by the Women's Joint Congressional Committee, of Washington, D. C., which appear in the Appendix.]

THE EQUAL PAY BILL AND THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT—LETTER BY MISS MARY ANDERSON

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to the Christian Science Monitor by Miss Mary Anderson, former Director, Women's Bureau, United States Department of Labor, on the subject of the equal pay bill and the equal rights amendment, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT OF FACTS ABOUT WATCHES—ADVERTISEMENT OF AMERICAN WATCH ASSEMBLERS' ASSOCIATION

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an advertisement entitled "Statement of Facts About Watches," by the American Watch Assemblers' Association, published in the New York Times of April 11, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Florida has the floor. If he will yield to me, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Austin	Hayden	Overton
Bail	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Bankhead	Hill	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hoey	Reed
Brewster	Huffman	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Brooks	Kilgore	Russell
Buck	Knowland	Saltonstall
Bushfield	La Follette	Shipstead
Butler	Langer	Stanfill
Byrd	Lucas	Stewart
Capehart	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McClellan	Taylor
Cordon	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McMahon	Tobey
Eastland	Magnuson	Tunnell
Ellender	Maybank	Tydings
Ferguson	Mead	Wagner
Fulbright	Millikin	Walsh
George	Mitchell	Wheeler
Gerry	Moore	Wherry
Green	Morse	White
Guffey	Murdock	Wiley
Gurney	Murray	Willis
Hart	Myers	Wilson
Hatch	O'Daniel	Young

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT], are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business, attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL SURPLUS APPROPRIATION RESCISSION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me for the purpose of having two conference reports considered and acted upon?

Mr. PEPPER. I am very glad to do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think there will be no objection to the conference reports, and that they will be acted upon immediately. They have been gone over very carefully by the conferees on the part of the House and of the Senate.

Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider the conference report on House bill 5604, the second supplemental surplus appropriation rescission bill.

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is privileged.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will state to the Senator from North Dakota that I am merely asking to have action taken on two conference reports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that they are privileged matters.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5604) reducing or further reducing certain appropriations and contractual authorizations available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 11 and 18.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 16, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 29, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$57,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"Naval Training Station, Port Deposit, Maryland, 1946, $50,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"Pay and subsistence of naval personnel, 1946, $200,000,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$125,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ", and neither the appropriation nor contractual authorization under this head shall be available after February 25, 1946, for the acquisition of land (other than for the authorized vessel-berthing program), except in pursuance of a specific appropriation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$190,784,500"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$652,986,950"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,015,379,424"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 10, 20, 23, and 30.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move the adoption of the conference report.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action respecting the amendments of the Senate numbered 20 and 30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its ac-

tion on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5604, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
May 9, 1946.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 10 and 23 to the bill (H. R. 5604) reducing or further reducing certain appropriations and contractual authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In the last line of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment, after "canceled", insert ": *Provided further,* That the rescission of $13,657,000 in the appropriation 'Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, 1946,' hereinbefore provided for in this act, is hereby canceled, and such appropriation is hereby increased by $11,763,480 by transfer of such an amount from the reduction hereinbefore provided for in this act in the 'Naval Stock Fund,' instead of such amount of $11,763,480 being carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In the last line of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment, after "amended" insert: ": *Provided,* That of the reduction of $1,080,000,000 made in the appropriation 'Defense aid-lend-lease' under title I of this act, $135,000,000 shall be transferred to the credit of the appropriation 'United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, 1944–46,' instead of being carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury."

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 20 and 30.

The motion was agreed to.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5890) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 10, 11, 14, 36, and 41.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 39, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, and 103, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$5,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$325,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$837,127"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 9, 40, 46, and 62.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. WHITE. To what appropriation bill does the conference report relate?

Mr. McKELLAR. The second deficiency appropriation bill. This is the final conference report.

Mr. WHITE. Is it signed by all the members of the conference committee?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. There was no objection, as I recall.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5890, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
May 8, 1946.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 40 and 46 to the bill (H. R. 5890) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Before the period at the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert ": *Provided,* That, effective May 1, 1946, the appropriation for salaries, Office of the Architect of the Capitol, contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1946, shall provide as follows: 'For the Architect of the Capitol, Assistant Architect of the Capitol (whose compensation shall be at the rate of $7,000 per annum), Chief Architectural and Engineering Assistant, and other personal services at rates of pay provided by law; and the Assistant Architect of the Capitol shall act as Architect of the Capitol during the absence or disability of that official or whenever there is no Architect, and, in case of the absence or disability of the Assistant Architect, the Chief Architectural and Engineering Assistant shall so act; $66,700."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert ": *Provided further,* That until December 31, 1946, upon request of the United Nations and its agreement to pay the cost and expenses thereof either by advancement of funds or by reimbursement, any executive department, independent establishment, or agency of the United States Government may furnish or may procure and furnish supplies and equipment to the United Nations and, when reimbursements are made by the United Nations, such reimbursements shall be credited to the appropriations, funds, or accounts utilized for this purpose current at the time obligations are incurred or such amounts are received from that organization."

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to amendments of the Senate numbered 9 and 62.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to thank the Senator from Florida for his kindness in yielding so that the two conference reports could be acted upon.

EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me so I may submit two matters? One is privileged and the other is necessary because of the impending date deadline.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. First, Mr. President, I ask that the message from the House of Representatives setting forth its action on Senate Joint Resolution 159 be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 159) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until July 1, 1946, to which were, after line 5, to insert:

SEC. 2. Section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) After May 14, 1946, no individual who has a child or children shall be inducted without his consent for training and service under this act. As used in this paragraph the term 'child' includes a child legally adopted, a stepchild, a foster child, and a person who is supported in good faith by the individual in a relationship similar to that of a parent and child but such term does not include any person 18 years of age or over unless such person is physically or mentally handicapped."

And after line 5, insert:

SEC. 3. So much of the first sentence of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, as precedes the first proviso is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of 20 and 30, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 20 after having been required to register pursuant to section 2 of this act, shall be liable for training and service in the land and naval forces of the United States."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, at the conclusion of my remarks I am going to move that the Senate agree to the House amendments; but before I do that I should like to make an explanation of what I believe is the feeling and the will of the Senate Military Affairs Committee in regard to this motion.

In the first place the ideas of the Senate Military Affairs Committee have already been expressed and are on the calendar in the form of what is known as Senate bill 2057. When I attempt to express the will of the Senate Military Affairs Committee I entertain no doubt at all that the committee has not changed its mind in regard to Senate bill 2057; that it will attempt to bring Senate bill 2057 into being as the law of the land.

Mr. President, in order to be fair to everyone I must also say that the motion to accept the amendments of the House of Representatives is acquiesced in by the committee because of the extreme situation due to the date line we face, and not because the committee is in agreement with the House amendments. As a matter of fact, I do not believe that any member of the committee is happy either over the motion I have to make or the result of the action of the House.

Also, in order to be fair, I should explain to the Senate that we hope to be able to take up Senate bill 2057 before the Draft Act comes to an end, in accordance with the action of the House and the action of the Senate the other day, that is, before July 1.

I shall say a word or two in explanation of the action taken by the committee. As everyone knows, the Draft Act will come to an end by law tonight at midnight if some action is not taken here today and if the President does not approve that action. Everyone knows that the draft act is an extremely complicated act. It not only calls men into the service, but it also attempts to take care of men after they have completed their service. Those sections of the act which are related to the veteran's welfare must in some way be kept alive, and it will be our aim to keep them alive, so that no person who has been drafted and who has entered into a contract with his Government under which his Government has made certain promises to him will lose the benefit of such promises.

There is, of course, a question in the minds of all of us as to the power and authority of the President of the United States to transfer, before midnight tonight, certain activities under the provisions of the act in order that rights and privileges may not be lost. There is so much doubt in our minds that it seems to us to be wise to extend the act as it is until July 1. It will then die by law on July 1; but at any rate it can die in an orderly manner, which will allow certain adjustments to be made to take care of the rights of those who have already served their Government, and we shall at least have another opportunity of reviewing the actual need for the extension.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 159.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator might state, if he sees fit, that the statement which he has made today was made after a meeting of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs at which there were present a goodly number of members, and at which the membership of the committee gave serious consideration to the question of the House amendments to the joint resolution which the Senate passed last week.

The statement of the Senator from Utah has been made with the full authorization of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs; and in making the statement he is stating to the Senate and to the country that we are proposing to accept the House amendments not because we favor them, not because we believe that those amendments are right or should be written into the law, but simply because of the compulsion of the emergency, due to the fact that the Draft Act expires at midnight tonight. In accepting these House amendments we in no way preclude or estop ourselves from endeavoring to do that which we think ought to be done in connection with the extension of the Draft Act. At the very first opportunity we shall endeavor to bring before the Senate the so-called Gurney bill, reported by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, with reference to the extension of the Draft Act, which bill is now on the Senate Calendar, and which, because of the press of other legislation, we have been unable to get before the Senate. But as soon as we can we will endeavor to bring that bill before the Senate for passage.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator for making our position doubly clear.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I feel it my duty to say something about this matter, for one reason, in order to show that the action of the committee is wholly nonpartisan. There is no element of party interest in this question. As we have done heretofore with respect to great measures which determine the attitude of the United States in the family of nations at this critical time, Republicans and Democrats have acted together in an attempt to find the way out of a dilemma.

I venture the opinion that the Senate has never been in a worse dilemma in a parliamentary sense than it is today in connection with this measure. We have discussed all possible ways of endeavoring to express our opinions by action with respect to the amendments adopted by the House, and we have finally reluctantly concluded that the only way available to us to do so is by statements on the floor of the Senate in connection with a vote to extend the draft law, if possible, for the meager time between now and July 1, 1946.

Mr. President, the seriousness of this situation is illustrated by some simple facts. Even with the draft law in existence as it stands on our books, there has been a descending scale of voluntary enlistments since last October, until during the month of April we succeeded in obtaining only 60,000 voluntary enlistments. The requirement was 185,000 for the month of April. Through the Selective Service as it is, and by means also of relaxing the physical standards and reviewing the IV-F cases, we were not able to fill the quota for the month of April. All we could get was a total, in round numbers, of 40,000 in addition to those who had enlisted, making approximately 100,000 recruitments for our armed forces, whereas we needed 185,000.

Mr. President, another vital fact to consider is this: The effect of the amendment relating to age is practically to prostrate the efforts of this great Government to maintain the standard of efficiency of the armed forces for the purpose of carrying out our commitments in the occupation of enemy territory, our own defense, our garrisoning of island bases, and our fulfillment of our commitment to the United Nations. The effect of what we do today by accepting the particular amendment relating to the age brackets is to cut down the possibility of obtaining selectees to 3,000 a month. Why is this? It is because during the past years men of 18 and 19 years of age have been selected; and all those who are 20 years of age, which is the age at which inductions would begin under this amendment, are now in the service, except those who have been deferred for one cause or another or those who have been reclassified by having regained their health or by having become competent, whereas they were incompetent at the age of 18 years. Those may not be all the reasons, but they are offered for consideration in regard to the dilemma in which we find ourselves at this moment. We will need 30,000 a month as a continuing program, after we have attained the number for July 1, 1946, namely, 1,550,000. We shall need 3,000 continually after that. Under the joint resolution with the proposed amendments all we could obtain would be 3,000, because the great pool, the great resource for manpower lies in the age group of 18 and 19 years.

We must not by our action give out to the world or to those brave boys who now are still in the service the impression or entitle them to form the opinion that this great Nation has become so enfeebled that it cannot maintain by one method or another which is strictly within the Constitution the necessary manpower to carry out our commitments for the great purpose of establishing security and peace in the world. The main objective, of course, is to create, such a

situation, by negotiations now going on, that we shall not have to have an Army or a Navy or an Air Force for the purpose of waging war; that we shall have to maintain only such armed forces as amount to peace forces, and tend to prevent the use of war as a means of settling disputes among nations. In other words, our greatest objective of all is peace. We aim to give our Government in the negotiations with the great powers of the world a standing which will command their respect, and we know very well, as a practical matter, that our conduct today subjects us to their utter contempt for voluntarily putting ourselves in a position of being one of the weakest of all the negotiators. I wonder how the negotiators in Paris look upon the action of this country which within one year had risen to the pinnacle of leadership in thought and in political power in the world. Do we wonder that they shoot at our planes as they come down to land on our own runways in Europe? How much cuffing about will now follow, so long as this country pursues the course of reducing its strength to the point of subjecting it to utter contempt?

Mr. President, if there is any effect in what I have to say I wish it to be that we have served notice to those over there who are vis-a-vis in those negotiations that the present action does not represent the considered judgment of the Senate, and that the Senate—whatever it does as a matter of expediency to save some parts of the wreck, and as a pure matter of salvage—still is determined to bring up this matter and within the earliest convenient time to pass a general bill with respect to the maintenance of the necessary manpower to keep this Nation strong and competent and give it some authority in the negotiations it is conducting and to keep it competent to defend itself if such an event should occur that the use of armed force would be necessary.

So I say for the Republicans on the committee that we reluctantly join in this motion. For varying and differing reasons on our side, we oppose these amendments, and probably we shall soon join with our Democratic friends on the committee in bringing to the attention of the Senate a review of these amendments along with consideration of general measures that are adapted to peacetime for maintaining the manpower of our country in the armed forces.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, there is little that I can add to what the distinguished Senators who have preceded me have said. However, I wish to make my position perfectly clear, namely, that I merely acquiesce in the House amendments. The amendments destroy everything selective service stands for, except to keep the offices and the boards and the records.

The Senator from Vermont has spoken of a dilemma. There will be a dilemma in the Army and Navy for those who have served long and well and faithfully when they find out that those who come on today are unwilling, because of congressional action and because of their own positions, to take their places in the armed forces and thus enable the married men to come home and also to enable those who have had long and distinguished service to return to their homes. Those who are in our Army and Navy believe that in this great democracy of ours the burdens as well as the joys should be shared.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Vermont and the distinguished Senator from Alabama did not mention the fact that some 200,000 students who are to graduate from college or high school during the coming month have been deferred in order that they might complete their education, and will not be selected because of the action which is to be taken in regard to the Selective Service Act. As a result, they will be put in a privileged class. Oh, yes; Mr. President; the Selective Service took those from the cotton mills and took those from the farm or wherever they may have been. They were not deferred. They were not completing their education, and so they were selected. But those of 18 or 19 years of age who were completing their education—the 200,000 of whom the Senator from Colorado has so ably spoken—have been deferred. With the July extension they would have been taken, but now they are to be deferred forever. Mr. President, injustice never pays.

I may add another word for those who may volunteer for the Army and the Navy. Some like the Navy; some prefer the Marine Corps; some prefer the Artillery; some prefer other branches of the services. There will be a general slump in volunteering, not only for the Army but for the Navy and the Marine Corps as well. As the Senator from Vermont said, the Army call for this month amounted to 125,000 volunteers, so they hoped, and 60,000 selectees, or a total of 185,000. That was the call for April. Of the total of 185,000 comprising the call, the armed forces got 101,000; and in that 101,000 there were a good many duplications due to the fact that when some are selected they are permitted to volunteer for service for the 18-month period.

Mr. President, I join in the hope that the day is not far away when justice will be done to those who have made sacrifices, and that they may have an opportunity to return to their homes and to resume their education.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. REVERCOMB addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield first to our leader the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], as well as all the members of the Committee on Military Affairs, for the assurance which they have given, not only to us but to the country and to the world, that the precipitate and unfortunate action which we are compelled to take does not represent the settled viewpoint of the Senate of the United States and, in my judgment, does not represent the settled viewpoint of the country as a whole.

It seems regrettable and rather difficult of understanding that the other House did not accept the joint resolution extending the Selective Service Act for 6 weeks. I do not criticize that body, although I understand that in the debate yesterday considerable criticism was made of the Senate on the ground that the Senate could have reached this subject and have disposed of it sooner if it had wished to do so.

Mr. President, neither body is perfect. In determining what course should be pursued, and in view of the deadline at midnight tonight, I imagine that the Senate Committee on Military Affairs was compelled to give consideration to the fact that if we should ask for a conference and return the resolution to the other House, it would be impractical to have a conference today except by unanimous consent of the other body, so the deadline would have been reached anyway. Criticism of the Senate for delay may have been justified, but it was very unbecoming of the other body to indulge in it.

Regardless of that fact, Mr. President, I see no other action which the Senate can take at this moment. I am happy that members of the committee have announced that what is being done is being done under compulsion. I am sure the Senate will act under compulsion, under circumstances which it cannot now control, and which might have been different if the Senate had heretofore proceeded in a different manner. However, Mr. President, all that is water over the dam, and I do not make the statement in any spirit of criticism.

If I am incorrect about this I should like to be put right, but it seems to me that since the end of the war our Nation has been more precipitant in its effort to cripple its power and its standing among the nations of the world than has any other nation which fought with us during the war. I do not recall that any other nation among the Allied Nations has been so precipitant and has run over itself so rapidly in trying to disband as fast and as completely as possible its military and naval organizations.

I realize that pressures are being brought to bear upon us. We are supposed to be able to resist some of them. I have received many letters in regard to maintaining an army in Japan, in China, in the islands of the sea, and wherever else we have military forces, and in those letters there were requests for an explanation of the situation. I have tried as honestly and as sincerely as I could to answer every letter which I received and explain the necessity for our maintaining sufficient military and naval power to carry out our obligations all over the world.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield for a moment so that I may propound a question to the majority leader?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall endeavor to answer to the best of my ability.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I should like to know whether we, who are Members of the Senate, have tried to ascertain whether the House, inasmuch as it is unwilling to agree to extending the date until July 1, would be willing to agree to extend it until June 15. In my opinion, 2 or 3 weeks would be a very important contribution to the time in which the subject may be considered. I may say to the majority leader that I personally feel the same as he has expressed himself. I believe that the present is one of the most unfortunate situations that have occurred in the Senate since I became a Member of it. I should like to know if the majority leader, who is skilled in parliamentary procedure and the art of conference, believes there is any chance of compromising this matter in order to afford us 2 or 3 weeks in which to give the subject a little more mature consideration?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have not conferred with Members of the other House as to whether they would be willing to accept a short period of extension. They had an opportunity to do so when the joint resolution was before the House, and they did not do so.

Mr. HAWKES. I know that the Senator is just as anxious as am I to obtain a little time in which to consider further the matter. I wonder if it is now too late—the Senator knows better than I do—to endeavor to ascertain whether the House and the Senate cannot agree upon some date between now and July 1.

Mr. BARKLEY. If we had 2 days for a conference, we might take a chance. But if the act is not extended today, it will expire at midnight tonight. I have no way of knowing whether a conference would be agreed to if we were to ask for one. If the other House refused to meet with us in conference where would we be left? The Military Affairs Committee has undoubtedly canvassed all possibilities and has decided that it would be the better part of wisdom to come before the Senate and make the motion which has been made by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. HAWKES. I have found during my life that sometimes when things seemed impossible of accomplishment they could be accomplished very quickly if they had in them the essence of justice and right. I think the issues today are on the side of justice and right.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's statement. I am sorry that I cannot give him a categorical answer to his question.

Mr. President, as I have already said, I have received perhaps as many letters with regard to this subject as has any other Member of the Senate. I have undertaken to explain to each correspondent why it is necessary to maintain as many forces as we now have in the Army and the Navy, and why we must keep them where they are now located. I have not yet received from a single correspondent any criticism after having taken him into my confidence and explained why it was necessary to maintain as large a force as we are now maintaining in different parts of the world. I believe that Members of both branches of Congress have an obligation to take persons into their confidence and explain things which those persons may not be able to understand because of their distance from the legislative process here in Washington.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the motion, but I join with all of those who have indicated that a vote for the motion will be no indication of the final judgment of the Senate on this important subject. I believe that whenever the American people are made fully aware of the necessities and the obligations as they exist, they will rise and meet them, now that the war is over, no less than they rose to the occasion while the conflict was in progress.

I wish also to have it understood among foreign nations, whether they are in conference now or may be in conference later, that no implications are to be drawn and no conclusions are to be reached by any of them because of the situation in which we now find ourselves in regard to the matter now before the Senate.

With reference to the bill on the calendar, I wish to state that if the conference report is agreed to, the Draft Act will expire again on the 1st of July. When that date arrives we shall be confronted with another question of time. We are in the same situation with reference to the Stabilization Act, which expires on June 30. That act is not ready for consideration by the Senate. It is still in the Committee on Banking and Currency, and the chances are that it will not be ready to be reported to the Senate this week, and probably not before week after next. In the meantime I should like to urge Senators to facilitate consideration of the bill now under consideration, which is controversial and which will involve some debate, and that we expedite the consideration of the draft measure as much as possible, having due regard for the rights of Senators to debate it. I do not want the Senate to get into such a situation that we will have a foot race between the OPA and the further extension of the draft, when both of them are about to expire again at the end of June. So I appeal to Senators to help facilitate the consideration of the pending measures.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I think, in view of what has been said, I should say now, before I yield to any other Senator, a word in regard to the parliamentary situation. It would be a very simple matter to throw the draft bill into conference. The House has already acted and sent over to us amendments to the Draft Act, embodying certain ideas. By laying aside the unfinished business we can act on S. 2057 very expeditiously. That will throw the two bills into conference, and we can spend, if necessary, the whole 6 weeks in working out a proper bill. As chairman of the committee, I am sure that our committee is ready to do that.

I say that merely to clear the minds of those Senators who have asked if there was not time between now and tonight to do something else. We can do that, and then we can take the whole 6 weeks in getting a perfected bill. From a parliamentary standpoint, it is very easy, if we could have Senate bill 2057 passed. Then if the House will go into conference with us on it, we can report back a bill which will be more than satisfactory, I am sure, to the country and fair to all concerned.

But, Mr. President, I have another obligation resting upon my shoulders. I do not want to talk about bill No. 2 until some action is taken on bill No. 1. The thing we have to do—and to that end these words of explanation have been given—is for us to accept the House amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 159, and then we will have 6 weeks or more in which to work.

I do not make this explanation to cut off members of my committee who I know want to say something, but I do make it in answer to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and in answer to the appeal the Senator from Kentucky has made.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. I merely wish to make the record a little more clear as to the number of men coming into the Army and to utter a word of caution to those who may think that the Selective Service is merely a scheme to get men into the Army. We should not forget the Navy. The Navy has had volunteers right along, but possibly the same difficulty now confronting the Army will soon also confront the Navy.

In the month of April the call of the Army on Selective Service was for 125,000 men, and the Army expected 60,000 volunteers, making 185,000. The selective-service boards, anticipating that the Selective Service Act would expire on May 15, provided only 40,000. There were volunteers of 60,000, making a total of 100,000. So, we were 85,000 short in the month of April.

The Army demobilization schedule for May and June is predicated upon their receiving about 100,000 men in May and 90,000 men in June. They anticipated with the renewal of the Selective Service Act that they would have 50,000 volunteers in the month of May and would call on the Selective Service for an equal number of men. In June they estimated 40,000 volunteers, and their call on the Selective Service would be for 50,000.

Now we are short 85,000 for the month of April, and we cannot expect that the number of men we anticipated will enter the service in May and June, so there will be a great shortage during the time between now and when the Congress enacts the renewal of the selective service law.

It is a great opportunity for the young men of America to recognize the call of the Nation and to come forward and volunteer their services to replace the boys who have been in the service a long time. I think many of the young men of the Nation will recognize that call and we will have volunteering beyond what some of us may at the moment expect.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I feel that I should make before the Senate the statement which I made before the Senate Military Affairs Committee

this morning as to my position upon the pending draft measure.

I am one of those who reluctantly voted for the action which was unanimously taken by the committee. It was unanimous because of the situation that has been explained by the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee. Different reasons were assigned by members of the committee for the positions assumed by them and for their attitude of reluctance.

I think that I should state frankly, that when any law is written permanently upon the subject—and I wish it were written in the pending measure—it should provide for the immediate discharge from the Army of fathers. I wanted to offer an amendment to that effect, but I learned and knew how futile it would be to attempt thus to amend this measure.

Mr. President, I think the exemption of men with families from service in the Army is of far greater importance than the question of not drafting teen-age boys. Fathers who are held in the service through the draft and are prevented from returning to their homes and their families are caused by their Government to neglect a duty which when not performed certainly involves a national danger. So I say I want written into this measure a provision requiring the release from the armed services of men with children or a child. That would not call for any new classification, because already there are being released from the armed services men with three children.

Mr. President, I wish to address in particular a remark to the General Staff of the Army, which makes the rules for release of men from the Army. Even without it being written into the bill they should take steps, and they are justified in doing so, for the immediate release of fathers.

Upon this point let me call some figures to the attention of the Senate. In January of this year, 1946, we were told by the members of the General Staff that they expected enlistments by July 1 of this year of 650,000, and that upon that basis they would release from the Army all except 120,000 fathers by July 1946. Because of the unexpected number of enlistments, in March of this year they revised their figures, and said they expected 950,000 volunteers by July 1, 1946, 300,000 more than they had estimated in January. So, Mr. President, if they could release all but 120,000 fathers upon a basis of 650,000 volunteers, certainly they can release those 120,000 when they have increased their enlistment estimate by 300,000. I make these remarks because I want to call the attention of the Army to the fact that they can act upon this subject without legislation upon it.

I subscribe wholeheartedly to the idea of a strong Army for the protection of this country, a strong Navy, and a strong Air Force, but I believe definitely that end can be attained through volunteers, and I believe my feeling is justified by the record that has been made since the voluntary enlistment bill was passed. As of April 30 of this year, 730,590 men had volunteered into the Army alone. More than 52 percent volunteered for 3 years' service. I had hoped that all inductions could be stopped, because I believe we will never get a Volunteer Army until the Army energizes and accelerates a plan to obtain volunteers.

March 8 of this year, without announcement to the public or to the Congress, the Army raised the passing mark on the classification test from 59 to 70, and thereby cut down the number of volunteers who enlisted in the Army. If the Army is to follow that course of action, we will never get a Volunteer Army so long as we give them men through enforced service. The mark of 59 for a soldier was good enough during the war, it was good enough for the American Army prior to the war, but the officials felt they must raise it to 70, and the result was the cutting of the volunteer forces. If the Army is going to continue on that kind of policy the Army itself will be responsible for the lack of volunteers.

I hope, Mr. President, when permanent legislation is written upon this subject, between now and July the first, if the Army will not issue an order releasing from the service men who have children, that there will be written into the new bill a direction that they shall do so. I trust, further, that by that time we will see clearly that enforced service is not necessary longer in this country, and that we may have an army of volunteers sufficiently large to meet the needs of the Nation's defense.

Mr. President, I support the measure as now presented primarily for one reason, namely, that if we let the law die tonight, the veterans of this war will lose their rights of reemployment preferment. I do not want that to happen. I think a great wrong would be done to them. So I hope that the motion will be agreed to, and that those rights may be saved to the veteran, and that when we write legislation upon this subject of a permanent nature, we may then all have our opportunity to present the measures and provisions we think will meet the situation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the able majority leader and the Senator from Vermont have both expressed very clearly the serious situation in which this Nation has been placed as a result of the parliamentary situation. In consequence of that and of the action we are forced to take today, we have undoubtedly weakened ourselves in dealing with the critical international affairs which confront us.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] has pointed out the problems of the fathers in the armed services, but I should not want this occasion to pass without saying a word on behalf of another group who perhaps are the forgotten men of the Army.

Overseas today, in Japan and in Germany, and in the other outposts where we find it necessary to keep our troops, are many single men who have had long months of service. Many of them have had combat service. They have not yet had the opportunity to marry and to raise families, and what has been done will be a serious blow to them. They have given some of the best months of their lives to this Republic, at great sacrifice, and I think they are deserving of better treatment than to be served notice that they may have to wait for a longer time because the Congress of the United States has not been able to meet a challenge which was very clearly before it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, can the Senator tell us the number of soldiers affected by the proposed legislation, who are now serving overseas or in this country and who expect to be discharged between now and July 1st?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I do not think any great number of soldiers will be affected. It is a matter of opinion. The Army has given us the figures as to the number needed to put the Army at a strength of 1,070,000 on the 1st of July 1947. They start out with the aim of having an Army of 1,500,000 on the 1st of July 1946.

I think—and this is merely an opinion—that, while, of course, it would be desirable to have all the volunteers and the inductees who are necessary to take the places of all those the Army desires to release, already the Army has done such a good job that not great numbers of men are to be affected as a result of the action taken today.

Mr. LUCAS. I gained the contrary impression from the statements made by other Senators.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The great problem is that of the difference between an Army of approximately 1,070,000 men on the 1st of July next year, and 1,500,000 on the 1st of July this year.

Mr. LUCAS. It is a fact, as I understand, that certain men will have to remain in the occupation zones and in the Army in this country as the result of the failure to draft 18- and 19-year-old men during the next 60 days.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. We know that the Army will have 1,500,000 on the 1st of July this year, because they now have them, and they are going to reduce the number somewhat up to that date. So the number who will be affected between this year and next year is represented by approximately the difference between 1,500,000 and 1,070,000, and those who should be released will be released, and those who desire to come in by voluntary arrangement will enter the Army.

No matter how it is figured, it is not a great number of men, but the idea of the Committee on Military Affairs, and I know the idea of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], who is defending the proposal for us, is that we should not impose an injustice upon anyone if we can avoid it.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, may I interrupt?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to have the Senator from South Dakota make a statement.

Mr. GURNEY. In reply to the Senator from Illinois, let me say that the length of service of 85,000 men in the Army was absolutely affected by the shortage in the

number of men who entered the armed forces in April. They were short that many men. Some who are already in the Army will have to stay that much longer. Eighty-five thousand men must stay longer because of the shortage in the month of April. How many more will have to stay longer because of the shortages in May and June I do not know.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am still in the dark, and there is no adequate answer to my question.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. There is no answer, because we are dealing with unknowns.

Mr. LUCAS. But it is a certainty that as a result of the failure to induct into the services during this month and up to July first, boys 18 and 19 years old some men must take their place, and those men are already in the Army, and so far as their service is concerned they are going to have to stay in the Army that much longer than they would have had to stay if the House had accepted the extension measure the Senate passed the other day. In other words, the men who have served long and faithfully will now serve for the boys who would have gone into the Army at the ages of 18 and 19.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true, but I cannot give the definite number of men involved.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, men now in the Army also will have to continue to serve for boys who would have been drafted before and would have been in the service except for the fact that we deferred them so they could finish their college educations.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I simply cannot understand it all.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The enlistments as of July 1, 1946, estimated by the General Staff of the Army, will be 950,000. In addition to that, there will be elistments in Philippine Scouts to the number of 50,000; making a total of a million men. Those are enlistments entirely; they are not draftees.

Now with respect to inductees. It has been somewhat of a surprise apparently to some that only 40,000 were taken in in the month of April. Senators will recall that after the fall of Japan the President fixed the monthly quota at 51,000, as I recall, and selective service has been taking about 35,000 a month. So 40,000 in April was really an increase in the number of inductees. That was in addition, as I have said, to the 60,000 volunteers. There is some overlapping there because some of the inductees volunteered. So if we have had 35,000 a month, it means that within the past year, as of July 1, 420,000 have been inducted. That would make a figure of 1,420,000 men who had volunteered and had been inducted, and who had not up to that time served more than a year in the services. That is a big army. Of course, there is some overlap, and I cannot tell how many of the 1,420,000 represent inductees and how many represent voluntary enlistments. So therefore servicemen of long service certainly ought to be out now, or definitely by July 1 of this year.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. May I ask the distinguished Senator if the Army contemplates final termination of the Selective Service Act, the Draft Act, at any fixed time or any particular time?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Army, of course, has made its plans for May 15, because that is the way the law reads. The Army has held out its hopes for July 1, because that is what the Senate measure provided.

Mr. GEORGE. Of the current year?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes; and that is what the Senate joint resolution would do. Under it the Draft Act would come to an end unless other legislation were passed between now and July 1.

Mr. GEORGE. Has the Army at any time ever suggested a termination date for the Selective Service Act?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; the Army has not. Various suggestions have been made by different witnesses. The Army has approved a measure which would extend the act for a year. The War Department asked for such action.

Mr. GEORGE. I am curious to know if the Army regards the Selective Service System as permanent. That is what the American people are anxious to know, I may say to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I hope the Army does not regard the selective service as a permanent system.

Mr. GEORGE. Is it not time that the Congress and the country were given rather definite advice on so important and so vital a matter as the drafting in peacetime of young men into the Army?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. So far as civilians can give advice to the Army it has been given, that it should not depend upon selective service. What is more, many of the witnesses who appeared before the committee said that they would rather have a volunteer army than an inducted army. What is still more, it has been pointed out time and time again to the Army that this is a subject upon which Congress must pass. No one has suggested a permanent selective service excepting one witness who suggested that it be continued indefinitely. No one agreed with that suggestion.

Mr. GEORGE. Does it not seem obvious to the distinguished Senator from Utah, who has given a great deal of thought to the subject, that so long as we have a mixture of the compulsory system with the volunteer system we are not going to secure the best results?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia has put into exact words the greatest of all problems facing the Army of the United States. We are fast coming to the position, due to the selective-service functioning in peacetime, where all those in the Army of the United States who command volunteered to command, and where all those who are commanded in the Army of the United States will be inducted to be commanded. Mr. President, if a nation cannot continue half slave and half free, neither can it continue, under such a system, to have an army which is at the highest peak of morale.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Georgia has asked a very pertinent question. I think the answer is that the Army has declared that it favors a volunteer army, an army composed of personnel raised by the volunteer system rather than by the Selective Service System. The Army has said, however, that in order to do the jobs it now has to do and in order to meet the commitments which have been imposed upon it, it must have an army of July 1 of this year, 1946, of 1,550,000 men; and that in order to meet its commitments and to do the work required of it, it must have an army a year from now, July 1, 1947, of 1,070,000 men. It would rather have a volunteer army. It hoped that Congress would do everything it could to stimulate and encourage the raising of a volunteer army; but that if it is to perform the tasks assigned it and meet its commitments it must have the number of men I have stated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wanted to make the same statement that the Senator from Alabama has made, with this addition, that the Military Affairs Committee warned the War Department time and time again that it ought not to depend upon an extension of the Draft Act on May 15; but it is also true that the War Department asked that it be given a 1-year extension of the Draft Act.

In regard to the question of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] as to how the action of the House and the Senate will affect the situation, the answer, of course, may vary with private opinion of different members of the committee who have studied the question. In my opinion, 200,000 replacements are affected. The size of the Army is not affected. I think the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] was entirely mistaken when he said that we are weakening the hands of the Secretary of State and our diplomats in France by this action, because the Army is going to have the size army it says it needs, regardless of this action.

The thing which is affected is replacements. The proposed action means that 120,000 fathers who should be discharged from the Army the 1st of July, and perhaps 80,000 combat troops and men with long service, will not be discharged, as they had hoped. That is about the whole story.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The fathers to whom the Senator has referred, and the men with long service, will not be discharged. They cannot be discharged, and they will have to serve in the places of 200,000 men who were subject to draft and who would have been drafted before this but for the fact that we deferred their service to

permit them to finish their college education.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I know that throughout the country there is an unusual interest in boys who are 18 or 19 years old. I can understand why a certain amount of pressure comes from mothers and fathers with respect to those boys, and why such pressure has its influence upon Members of Congress. But I wish to make what I believe to be a pertinent observation. We must also take into consideration the mothers, fathers, and wives of the 200,000 men who are left in the Army and are serving in the places of a couple of hundred thousand boys who have performed no military service. This is one of those things which works both ways. It is a two-edged sword.

Mr. HILL. Exactly. In that connection the Senator from Illinois will no doubt be interested to know that the Gurney bill for the extension of the draft which the Senate committee reported, and which is now on the calendar, provides, as I recall, for the discharge on August 1 of approximately 120,000 fathers, and, beginning October 1, the discharge of men who have had 18 months' service.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask one further question.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. How many volunteers are in the Army at the present time?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. By the 1st of June there will be 950,000.

Mr. LUCAS. We should certainly be rid of selective service by June 1947, or before then, if the Army needs only a little more than 1,000,000 men to take care of the situation at that time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I think we should keep the record straight. We must remember that some of the men who volunteered did so last September, and many of them volunteered for only 18 months. Their 18 months might well expire before July 1, 1947. I did not want the impression to be created that, come what may, we might have sufficient volunteers to provide an Army of 1,070,000 on July 1, 1947.

Another thing we must remember is that we cannot have 1,070,000 on July 1, 1947, and then on July 2, July 4, July 5, or July 10 drop far below 1,070,000. As the distinguished Senator from Illinois knows, much depends upon the jobs and commitments imposed on the Army, upon what we do about overseas garrisons, upon what we do about the armed forces we now have in defeated enemy territory, and many other things which might change during the next year, and which might have a determining effect. So far as the Army can now see, it must have 1,070,000 men on July 1, 1947; but that does not mean only on that date. It undoubtedly means for several months afterward.

Mr. LUCAS. I think it is a fair statement to make and a logical conclusion to reach that if the rate of enlistment continues during the next year as it has during the past year, we shall have a sufficient number of men in 1947 to take care of the needs of the Army, through the voluntary system.

Mr. HILL. With respect to the rate of enlistment, of course the Senator recognizes that the rate of enlistment has declined very much. Yesterday Representative SPARKMAN, of Alabama, in the debate in the House, made the following statement:

> Our heaviest month for volunteers was in November of last year. In November 1945 we had nearly 185,000 volunteers. But listen to how the number has fallen off month by month: December, 131,000; January, 113,000; February, 93,000; March, 73,000; April, 63,000. You can see where that curve is leading; it is leading to a dangerous situation.

We must remember also that the effect of adopting the House amendments and no longer drafting boys of 18 or 19 will undoubtedly be substantially to reduce voluntary enlistments, because many men in that age group have volunteered because they realized that if they did not volunteer they would be drafted.

Mr. LUCAS. If we do not solve some of our economic problems there will be plenty of volunteers.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, this seems to be an anomalous situation. Apparently the Senate is about to take action unanimously on a proposal with which not a single Senator has expressed agreement. Not a single Senator has approved the proposed action. That is certainly a very extraordinary situation. Not one voice has been raised in behalf of the merits of the proposal which the committee asks us to approve. That fact certainly invites exploration. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has made a very impressive, and almost alarming, statement as to the situation in which we shall be left.

Reference has been made to the other body. While we do not need to hold any brief for that body, the fact remains that that body did take action in this matter more than 4 weeks ago and sent the measure over here. For the remaining 4 weeks the entire responsibility for drifting over what is now alleged to be a Niagara Falls rests upon those in this body who have not given an opportunity for consideration. I think that should be made very plain before the Congress and the country, in justice to all concerned, and that those responsible for determining the program of this body should give us as plausible an explanation as possible as to why this question has not previously been considered. It seems to me that that is a question which the country is going to ask.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. First, in response to the pertinent remarks made by the able Senator from Maine, what the Senator has said emphasizes the fact that eventually the time will have to be recognized as having arrived when the rules of the Senate will have to be adapted to the necessity of disposing of public business.

We debated the British loan in the Senate for a little more than a month. I am not making any point of the fact that we did not stay in session every day, nor of the fact that the rules of the Senate and the arrangement of the duties of Senators have been so imperfect in the past that we were distracted by many interruptions of committee work and other things during the course of that debate. I hope, by the early adoption of the La Follette committee report, that it will be possible for us to segregate our weeks into certain days for committee meetings, certain days for Senate sessions, and perhaps even night sessions, and that it will be possible for us to expedite our business. But we can never transact the public business with the dispatch which the public demand requires until we have the capacity and the leadership in the Senate to outline and lay out a program for the Senate's business, and then require some reasonable observance of that program.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Maine well recognizes the fact that after a bill once comes before this body, unless the leadership feels that it should be laid aside, or can well be laid aside, there is no way by which the leadership can determine when there shall be action on that bill. We still have free and unlimited debate in this body. Senators can continue to do what they did in regard to the British loan, namely, speak as long and practically as many times as they wish to.

There may be a question as to whether we should have laid the British loan measure aside. There were many Senators who felt that, important as was the extension of the Selective Service System, it was no more important than the British loan. To lay the British loan measure aside after we had once begun its consideration would have been more unfortunate—perhaps even more tragic insofar as our foreign relations are concerned and insofar as the part which we may be playing in the affairs of the world and in trying to build the peace at this time is concerned—than to let the Selective Service Act expire. Surely there was much to be said in favor of keeping the British loan measure before this body until it was finally disposed of.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will permit me to conclude, I shall appreciate it very much; and I am sorry to have interrupted him so long.

I thoroughly subscribe to what the able Senator from Alabama has said. The answer is not in laying aside one piece of legislation for another piece of legislation, but the answer lies in making it possible for the leadership to budget in some reasonable measure the length of time available for debate on pending measures, and then to adhere to the budget which has been established.

To recur to the pending measure, Mr. President, let me say that I do not understand why there is anything so important about the labor bill which is the unfinished business that would give it priority of consideration over the emergency of

providing an army for the United States of America.

There is another anomalous situation—and I do not say this because I am not in favor of some of the amendments which have been proposed and some which will be proposed to the committee bill dealing with labor—which we now are allowing ourselves to present. Everyone admits the folly of the United States military policy that is embodied in this bill, and yet we are about to proceed for days and perhaps for weeks to debate a rather vain labor bill, after sacrificing the national interest—namely, the national security—and possibly endangering the future peace of the United States and of the world.

I would certainly be one of those who would look with great favor upon a request by the Senator from Utah, as chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, that the Senate put first things first. If this matter is of the importance that has been suggested, it should be given that degree of priority on the Senate Calendar.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not have the floor.

Mr. President, if I may make one further observation, I shall not interrupt any more. The third consideration I submit is that, although I may not have been fully informed as to what our representatives are doing in respect to foreign affairs, nevertheless, frankly, I have been a little disappointed that there has not appeared in the newspapers, at least so that we might know about it or so that we could obtain the information otherwise, news that our Government has been making a determined, persistent, and effective effort, in collaboration with Great Britain and Russia, by which all nations could reduce their military establishments. That may have been tried and there may have been a failure on the part of our foreign-policy-making officials; but I should like to know whether our Secretary of State has made an appeal to the British and the Russian Governments, and also to other governments in so far as they, too, are in the scheme, that all of us shall abandon compulsory military training and that all of us shall agree upon a limited personnel for military forces. I do not know when we are ever going to get around to it if we do not start rather soon. I am not complaining and I do not mean to criticize our State Department, but I wish to know whether a determined effort is being made to relieve the taxpayers and the young men of this country from the continuing burden of military service in peacetime, after we have won the greatest war in history.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Along the line the distinguished Senator from Florida has been speaking, let me say I am sure he recognizes the fact that, no matter how strong an army or navy or an air force we have, throttling of the industrial capacity of this Nation would cut a hole in the dikes of our national defense. The reason why the unfinished business—not the selective-service measure, but the labor measure which is the unfinished business—is before the Senate of the United States is that the economic life of the Nation was being slowly but surely strangled; and the issue with which the Senate was confronted and is now confronted is whether any man or any group of men or any organization has the right to use his or its power to strangle the economic life of 140,000,000 Americans.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I should like the attention of the Senator from Florida, not with the idea of educating him, for that is something I would not undertake to do, but for the purpose of telling him that in the Committee on Military Affairs the subject he has mentioned was considered, with respect to its bearing upon the number of men—that is, the minimum number—estimated as necessary for the carrying out of our commitments. I refer to our commitments at home and abroad. Among the assumptions indulged was the very favorable one, I think so far as to the United States in concerned, that within a reasonable time we would be able to complete the definitive treaties of peace with respect to Austria and Italy, for example, and thereupon withdraw our troops from those countries.

Already we have discovered that that assumption was not well founded. We are not going to be able to make the progress with those treaties of peace that we assumed we would make. In the meantime I have seen it reported that the Secretary of State of the United States has made proposals for the withdrawal of troops from different places around the world.

In the interest of peace, in the interest of the theory of having a universal arrangement which will be effective in the cause of security and peace, instead of unilateral arrangements made by great nations for themselves, is it not wise, as a practical question which we must face, for us to occupy those enemey countries with our troops so long as our representatives are vis-à-vis with the representatives of other nations in the negotiations which are going on there? It is a practical question. It is one which I think carries its own answer. For example, what kind of a picture would be presented to the negotiators if our troops were withdrawn from the position which they occupy with respect to Trieste and the boundary there which is under dispute? What position would this country be in if we removed our troops from the American occupation zone in Germany, and if France kept her troops there, and if Russia kept hers there, and if Britain kept hers there?

Mr. President, these questions are vital to us. All we can do in passing on the question of manpower, as I see it, is to consider these matters, not in the light most favorable to us, but in the reasonable light which leads us to believe that for some time to come the figures 1,550,000 as of July 1, 1946, and 1,070,000 as of July 1, 1947, are certainly the minimum, and that there is a possibility that we shall need more.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] wishes to obtain the floor in order to speak upon another matter. I think that before my motion is put to a vote I should at least make another statement.

All my life I have been trained in what some persons call science. It is extremely difficult for me to talk about unknowns. Therefore, I cannot project myself into the future and state what will take place in the middle of next month in regard to international relations, the Army, or anything else. There is one thing, however, which is known and which is based on facts. Neither the world, nor even the American people, will decide with regard to the strength of the United States, or the obligations of the United States to its allies, on the basis of some action taken today or some action taken yesterday. The United States has already made its program clear so far as an international organization is concerned. We shall have all the troops which it will be necessary for us to have. They will be strong regardless of anything that may be done so far as satisfying the demands of the world in meeting our obligations to the United Nations Organization is concerned. There were only two persons who were foolish enough to announce to the world that democracy was weak. Those two persons are now dead. The name of one of them was Mussolini and the name of the other was Hitler. No one will judge the strength of the United States and its ability to create great armies in order to carry into effect its program, on the basis of whether we are short 1,000 troops in accordance with a certain quota. Our obligations will be lived up to. Everyone in the world knows that they will be lived up to because America has not often failed in her promises. The Army of the United States is today very strong. Its potential strength is very much greater. There is no desire on the part of anyone that we shall maintain an Army of 8,000,000 men such as we had during the war. That Army, great and glorious as it was, Mr. President, did not in any sense represent what is called the full strength of the United States. We base our strength upon our morals, upon our history, upon our determination, and upon the will of our people, quite as much as upon any other factors.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, I believed it to be necessary to make the statement which I have made. If somebody unwisely assumes that we are taking a backward step, that person will be very badly disappointed.

I believe the discussion is now over, and I should like to have the question put to a vote of the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hesitate to interrupt the Senator's remarks. I was not present in the Chamber when the session began. The Senator from Utah and other Senators have spoken about the strength of the Army. I should like some information. How does the pending

measure affect the so-called strength of the Navy so far as its volunteers are concerned.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I believe that, in theory and in fact, the Navy will not be affected. The Navy stated, through its representatives, that volunteers are coming into the Navy because, primarily, the draft act is in existence. However, that is one of the unknowns. Personally I believe that service in the United States Army and in the United States Navy will continue to be very attractive to many of the thoughtful youth of our Nation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Insofar as the information known to the Senator is concerned, voluntary enlistments in the Navy have been holding up very well, have they not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Navy has been receiving enlistments during the past few months at a monthly average rate of 13,000. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has some figures with regard to the situation. I believe that 13,000 a month is the Navy's quota.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I will quote from General Hershey, who referred correctly to the position of the Navy. I know that his reference was a correct one because I also listened to Secretary Forrestal on the same subject. I read:

> The Navy Department estimates 328,000 of that number—
>
> That is, of 384,000—
>
> will be under contract September 1, provided the current rate of enlistments continues. Assuming an additional attrition of 13,000 enlisted personnel through August, the Navy Department will require 185,000 enlistments from civilian life by September 21, or 27,000 monthly in order to meet a postwar strength of 500,000. The Navy believes that their 2- and 3-year contracts will offer sufficient inducements for voluntary enlistments, and that its goal will be reached by September 1. Inasmuch as the enlistments from civilian life are almost entirely made either from persons who are liable or who are about to become liable for military service under the provisions of the Selective Service Act, I am of the opinion that termination of the act will seriously affect their recruiting program.

That was the opinion of the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, may we have a vote?

Mr. LANGER and Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. May we have a vote on my motion?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to make an inquiry. I wonder if I may have the floor in order to speak in opposition to the position taken by the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, what is now the parliamentary situation? Are we about to vote on the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All in favor of the motion——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah has no right to occupy the floor until the vote has been taken on the motion. The Senator from North Dakota has been waiting for the Senator from Utah to sit down, but he refuses to sit down until a vote is taken.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I am sure that the Senator from Ohio is indulging in some of those great unknowns about which I have spoken. If he has any reason for saying that the Senator from Utah intends to do this or that, and is sure of what he says, I shall be glad to have him say so.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I did not make a point of order during the discussion which has been held, but the discussion was subject to a point of order at any time because the Senator from Utah was occupying the floor, farming it out to various Senators, and then concluding by making a speech. I do not believe that is the proper way to proceed under the rules of the Senate. I did not raise an objection, but I do not think the procedure was correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah still has the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think the Senator from Ohio should be informed that the Senator from Utah obtained the floor by asking the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to yield for a certain purpose. Until that purpose is accomplished I believe that the Senator from Utah has the right to hold the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah may hold the floor, but not to the exclusion of some other Senator who wishes to speak on the same subject.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah has never attempted to do that. The Senator from North Dakota asked to be recognized. Because of the papers which the Senator from North Dakota was holding in his hands, I assumed that he wished to speak upon another subject. Therefore, I asked the Senator from North Dakota—and if there is anything discourteous in this I should like to have the Senator from Ohio point it out—if he would not be willing to wait until the Chair put the question before the Senate, and then ask me to yield to him.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from North Dakota informed us later that he wanted to speak on the pending motion. If the Senator from North Dakota desires to speak on the motion, I shall be glad to have him do so, but the Chair should remember that I asked for two specific things when I took the floor. When the motion shall be carried one of them will have been accomplished, and I asked the Senator from North Dakota if I might not accomplish the other one, too. I do not think there has been any discourtesy. I do not think there has been any need for what has been said about the action of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, perhaps I could be helpful to the Senator from North Dakota. I think the RECORD will show that the junior Senator from Florida had the floor and that he yielded it to permit the disposition of the business which was to be presented to the Senate by the able Senator from Utah.

If the Senator from North Dakota was fearful that if he did not at the present time obtain leave to speak to the Senate because of the fact that the junior Senator from Florida had the floor, I shall be glad to assure him I shall gladly yield to him as soon as this matter is disposed of. I should not like to lose the floor, but I should be glad to yield to the Senator for as long as he would like.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to speak on the pending business; and I have a right to do so, under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. As I understand, the pending business has been temporarily laid aside so that the privileged business can be considered. Does the Senator wish to speak in regard to the motion that has been made as a privileged matter?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to speak on the business that has been made a privileged matter, and which has been discussed by the distinguished Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is entitled to speak on the motion.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I rose to take a position opposite to that expressed by the distinguished Senator from Utah. I desire to speak at some length, and I request that I not be interrupted until I have concluded. Then I shall be glad to answer any questions.

First of all, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to an article which appeared in the Washington Daily News on the 7th of May last entitled "Million Volunteers Forecast for Army, Setting a Record." I read from the article:

> The United States will have a regular standing Army of 1,000,000 volunteers by the end of June, Maj. Gen. H. N. Gilbert, chief of Army personnel, procurement, predicted today.
>
> At the same time, General Gilbert warned the Nation cannot maintain a regular peacetime volunteer Army until the War Department can compete for manpower on equal footing with private industry. He said it would be necessary to continue selective service "indefinitely"—perhaps for 3 years.
>
> In 7 months, General Gilbert reported, the Army has recruited 737,144 men—"the largest Army of volunteers ever maintained by any country at any time.

Imagine that, Mr. President—never before in the history of the world has any country had a larger army of volunteers at any time than we have at the present time.

> In November, more than 189,000 enlisted. Since October, the Army has obtained an average of 105,000 new soldiers each month.
>
> May and June are expected to produce between 250,000 and 300,000 new men, drawn largely from high school graduating classes. General Gilbert said surveys indicate at least 25 percent of senior class boys plan to enlist this summer. There is reason to hope, he said, that 17- to 18-year-old enlistments will "run even higher," particularly if Congress approves a pay raise bill now pending.

Mr. President, I have listened with much interest to the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]. I wish to say, first of all, that the youth of this country, the GI's, the veterans, have had no better friend upon this floor than the senior Senator from North Dakota. How well I remember when I rose shortly after the war broke out and asked that the pay

of a buck private be made $100 a month. It is significant that I was sustained in my argument by Senator Bennett Clark, now a distinguished Federal judge, at that time a Senator from the State of Missouri, a man who at one time was the national commander of the American Legion. Senator Clark at that time said that $100 a month, instead of $50 for a buck private in his opinion was right, and just, and proper, and fair.

Instead of my suggestion being followed, we had the spectacle here in the United States of two brothers, both eligible for service, one of them going into the Army at $50 a month, while when President Roosevelt asked the Senate that the amount of salary the other brother could receive sould be limited to $67,200, or a net of $25,000, the suggestion was turned down by the Congress of the United States. I believe I was the only Republican voting for it at that time, although there may have been one more. I recall today the fact that from the beginning the senior Senator from North Dakota did everything in his power to get the buck private decent pay, $100 a month.

Mr. President, it is significant that a few months ago one of General MacArthur's right-hand men came back from the South Pacific, a distinguished gentleman, a man who three times had been Governor of the great State of Wisconsin, Mr. Philip La Follette. Mr. Philip La Follette appeared before the Committee on Military Affairs and said, basing his answers upon the experience he had had, that he believed the men who volunteered should now receive $100 a month, that that would do more to cause young men voluntarily to enlist than anything else that could be done.

Mr. President, what was the strength of the Army on May 1 of this year? Exclusive of officers on terminal leave, the Army's strength was 2,100,000 men and women. The Army's strength goal for July 1, 1946, is 1,550,000 men and women, so there is a surplus today of 550,000 men and women.

I have here an analysis of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 6, 1946, page 3326:

Approximate enlistments by July 1, 1946	900,000
Philippine Scouts	50,000
Men not in service a year	226,000
Draftees not in a year	400,000
Total	1,726,000
Army strength goal on July 1, 1946	1,500,000
Estimated surplus (as estimated by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, who is a member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs)	226,000
Estimated surplus July 1, 1946 (according to prediction of Major General Gilbert, Chief of the Army Procurement that there will be an increase of a million by July 1, 1946)	326,000

Mr. President, a few days ago I discussed this matter rather fully over the radio, on a national hook-up. I said at that time:

We won the war. But we are losing the peace. We are losing the peace because we are doing all kinds of double-talk about supporting the United Nations to restore and keep world order and at the same time calling for vast armed might of our own by which to threaten the rest of the world. We are losing the peace because we are telling ourselves that everybody trusts us and believes in our peaceful intentions while announcing to the world by our actions that we are not going to trust anybody. We are losing the peace because we are trying to substitute power politics supported by B–29's and atomic bombs for constructive statesmanship. We are losing the peace because we keep asserting that the war is not over and that we must maintain further into peacetime all our war-inspired restrictions and regimentations, including military conscription.

Mr. President, as I view it the war ended more than a year ago. We have been proud here in America that the only time we have ever conscripted men has been in wartime; that we have never done so in peacetime. Personally I am entirely and unequivocally and absolutely and completely opposed to conscripting men and women in peacetime. Anyone who has read history knows very well how in Europe this insidious method of conscription began and has grown and grown until today it is a festering sore upon the political life of Europe.

Conscription starts generally on a small scale; it is instituted for a few months, and a little later it is extended for a year, and then some time later conscription is extended for 2 years, and later it is made to cover a period of 3 years. Then conscription is fastened forever upon the people of a country.

Mr. President, some of the very best citizens of America have come to our shores in order to escape 1, 2, 3 and 4 years of universal military conscription which was in effect in their fatherland or in their motherland. So far as I am concerned, I do not propose to have military conscription in peacetime fastened on the people of the United States of America if I can help it.

I repeat what I stated in my broadcast:

The war is over. The sooner we recognize that fact and set ourselves to rebuild democracy and justice at home and help inspire and maintain them abroad, the better promise we will have of winning the peace. This false alarm, "The war is not over" is being used by Secretary Patterson and General Eisenhower as official spokesmen for the War Department to foist upon America military conscription in peacetime. After having failed to pressure Congress and the American people into the acceptance of peacetime conscription for military training, they now come before us and declare that the war is not over.

That this effort to extend selective service now is part of a long-range plan to fasten conscription on America as a permanent policy is quite clear when one puts all the pieces of the puzzle together. Even before the war had ended powerful forces in the Government had launched a drive to get a universal military training law on the books. When the religious and educational forces of the Nation, the laborers and the farmers, and many of its wisest statesmen repudiated this move, the War Department went before the Committees on Military Affairs of the Congress and requested that the wartime draft be extended indefinitely.

Mr. President, when the religious and educational forces of the Nation, when the representatives of churches, when a great many of the presidents and professors of our colleges in America filed petition after petition protesting to Congress against universal military conscription in peacetime, when laborers and farmers, and many of our wisest statesmen repudiated this method, the War Department went before the committees on Military Affairs of the Congress and requested that the wartime draft be extended indefinitely.

If it had not been for the great work done by the religious leaders in America, if it had not been for the magnificent fight put up by the presidents of a great many of our universities, we would long ago have carried out the wishes of members of the War Department who appeared before the various committees. It was only because of the magnificent fight of the religious leaders and of the educational leaders and of leading farmers and businessmen that this has not been done up to the present time. When these religious leaders, educators, farmers, and businessmen were assured that the Congress would not write the War Department this blank check, then the War Department agreed—to what? To take a 1-year extension—the very thing the Department originally said it could not do——but it required that conscription be applied to all citizens from 18 years to 45 years of age. This just shows what public opinion, led by the religious forces and the educational forces of America, succeeded in getting the Army to do when they mustered their forces and came before the proper committees of this great body.

Since the House has passed a bill exempting the 18- and 19-year-old boys in response to public opinion outraged at the prospect of using these boys for police in Europe and Asia—

And that is what they wanted these boys for originally; they wanted 18- and 19-year-old boys to be used as police in Europe and Asia. They wanted to take them out of school and make policemen out of them.

Since the House has passed a bill exempting the 18- and 19-year-old boys in response to public opinion outraged at the prospect of using these boys for police in Europe and Asia, the Secretary of War now states for publication that if Congress will let them keep drafting these youths they won't send them abroad. First they tell us they can't get along without these boys and keep the necessary forces overseas. And then the Secretary of War tells us they don't need them for foreign-occupation troops at all. They will just keep them at home—in the Army, of course. Well, I say let's keep them at home—on the farms and in the factories, in school and college, and give them a chance to become decent and useful American citizens.

Let them stay at home with their parents instead of taking them into camps away from the fine home influences of which we Americans are so proud.

Two months ago I introduced a bill in the Senate to declare that the war is terminated so far as war legislation is concerned. I had already introduced a bill last September to stop the involuntary induction of men into land and naval forces of the United States under the Selective Service Act. I introduced these bills in the confident belief that we are impeding the recovery of our liberties at home and the reestablishment of freedom elsewhere by the hypocritical pretense that we are still at war. To be sure, we do have

great problems before us. But we shall not settle them by maintaining wartime controls and a wartime military draft.

Mr. President, I have here a letter which I received from my home State of North Dakota, from the Young Men's Christian Association, at Grand Forks, N. Dak., which is the second largest city in our State.

Senator LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I am writing as one of your constituents—

This letter is written to me by the general secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association, of Grand Forks, N. Dak., a man who deals with the very finest in life.

I am writing as one of your constituents to urge you to use all of your energies in opposition to military conscription.

I served as an enlisted man through five campaigns in Europe during the past war—

Here is a young man, Leonard H. Engstrom, of Grand Forks, N. Dak., general secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association, who served as an enlisted man through five campaigns during the recent war. He continues:

and I feel capable and obligated to express an opinion opposing military conscription.

I share identical views with Senator GLEN H. TAYLOR, of Idaho, as expressed in his radio address over Columbia Broadcasting System on Saturday, April 20.

I will be watching with interest for the views which you express in opposition to military conscription.

Yours very truly,
LEONARD H. ENGSTROM,
General Secretary.

Continuing with my radio address, I said at that time:

Again we are told by these advocates from the Pentagon Building that we must have a continuation of the draft in order to meet our foreign commitments. Now just what commitments are these gentlemen talking about? There are insinuations that our signature to the Charter of the United Nations has obligated us to occupy the rest of the world, to maintain armed garrisons all around the globe. We have agreed to help occupy Japan and Korea and Germany. But why do we need troops in Iceland and Egypt and Canada and China and some 50 other parts of the world?

Why should the fine young men of this country who want to make a success in life, who want to serve apprenticeships in various businesses, who want to go to college and get an education—young men who want to get married and establish their own homes and have their own families—be sent to Iceland, Egypt, Korea, and China, and 50 other parts of the world?

Secretary Patterson, under cross-examination before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, admitted that if we did away with guarding surplus supplies abroad no further conscription of troops would be necessary.

Mr. President, I do not take as serious view of this question as perhaps some of my colleagues do, because I remember so well, only a few days ago, when the distinguished majority leader in this body stated that it was more important that we give away $3,750,000,000 than to consider the question of universal military training. The British loan was far more important than the discussion of universal military training. Every Senator who was present at that time will remember that statement by the distinguished majority leader. It was far more important to make the loan to Great Britain; and he stated that if the loan to Great Britain were not out of the way by the 15th of May it would be just too bad that we would have no draft law, but that we would get along in some way or other. He stated that we had to pass the loan to Great Britain first. So I really do not see very much to worry about today, when giving away $3,750,000,000 of our money to the British was more important, so the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky said, than having the draft law passed by the 15th day of May.

To repeat:

Secretary Patterson, under cross-examination before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs admitted that if we did away with guarding surplus supplies abroad no further conscription of troops would be necessary.

He now says that they need these troops, not to occupy Korea, China, Iceland, or any other country, but to guard surplus property—trucks, jeeps, and what not.

What a travesty on common sense and honesty, that we are being cajoled and frightened and threatened into extension of conscription to provide men who can watch our tractors rust away on Pacific islands, to stand guard over beer going stale, 500,000 cases of it in Guam alone, according to Time magazine, to keep naked natives in India from taking blankets that will be burned in the end anyway.

We take our boys out of school and send them over to Guam to stand guard over half a million cases of beer, according to Time magazine.

Why do we keep these surplus supplies all over the world at enormous expense? Is it in order to make a case for an army to guard them? And how much longer are we going to permit this thing?

Now here is another picture for intelligent Americans: We are asked to maintain troops in Germany. And recently in Paris Secretary Byrnes proposed a treaty to bind us to continue occupation of Germany for a quarter of a century. One of the reasons why this is regarded as necessary is to put down disorder among a people that are actually starving to death. Yet we are asked to keep on conscripting men to guard supplies much of which could be used to create the food and clothing and other necessities to relieve this need. But because we have no statesmanship adequate for this, we are further asked to conscript men to stand ready to shoot down hungry Germans who may grow too impatient with our blundering.

That is along the line of what was said today by the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

If we want to talk seriously about our commitments to create world order, to establish democracy and to preserve peace, we must abandon this illusion of peace by threat, of democracy by compulsion, and of order by deploying military power all over the globe. In place of these purely negative and repressive measures we must turn to positive and constructive ones.

Let us look a little further at the case of the War Department for extension of the draft beyond its expiration date of May 15. We must not gamble with national security, we are told.

They say, "Do not gamble with national security. Do not take that responsibility."

But it is not our national security that is in danger. We have and are able to maintain by voluntary enlistment a Navy bigger and more powerful than all the rest of the navies of the world. We have air forces, well equipped and well based, which excel the air power of any other nation and are more powerful than all the others combined. We can maintain these forces without further drafting men for their ranks. And we alone possess the atomic bomb, which dwarfs all the military power of the rest of the world. For the first time in the history of the world, one nation—ourselves—could annihilate the military establishments and the centers of population of the rest of the world. If it is defense that we seek, there has never been a nation more secure from defeat than the United States is today.

But the suspicion grows here—as it certainly has already grown abroad—

It grows in Washington; it grows in Oklahoma; it grows in North Dakota; it grows in Michigan; it grows in Ohio; it grows in Maine. The suspicion grows all over the United States—

that it is not national security that is sought by this new policy of conscription in peacetime for our tremendous naval and air power and the atomic bomb cannot be used for policing and dominating other peoples.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I prefer not to yield at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). The Senator from North Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the suspicion to which I have referred has grown not only here in Washington but all over the United States. That suspicion is, as I said in my radio speech—

That it is not national security that is sought by this new policy of conscription in peacetime, for our tremendous naval and air power and the atomic bomb cannot be used for policing and dominating other peoples. And even if we blasted the rest of the world to ruins, we would still have to have ground forces to retain control over the ruins. In short, the kind of overwhelming military and naval power we possess is really not sufficient to establish nor maintain empires. For this a nation must have armed garrisons. Are we being asked to stand ready to stand guard over the remnants of Britain's disintegrating empire? Or are we getting ready to launch an empire-building program of our own? Are we getting ready to pull British chestnuts out of the Near East fire where Russia is bidding for the oil of Iran and Iraq and Arabia by the very same methods that have given Britain a practical monopoly over the oil of these countries? Are we ready to guarantee that the Mediterranean is to remain a British lake, denying to Russia at the Dardenelles what we are protecting for Britain at Gibraltar and Suez? Must we conscript our boys—

And, Mr. President, in some instances that means boys who already have served in our armed forces, boys who already have gone to Europe and have served 1 year or 2 years. Must we conscript them, as I said in my speech over the radio—

to keep British troops in Indonesia and India where they shoot down the colonists for seeking the freedom we fought Britain for a century and three-quarters ago?

Reduced to its final analysis, extension of the draft—

As I view it—

is demanded as a countermeasure against fear of Russia.

Mr. President, I am one Senator who believes that this country never again should go to war. I am one Senator who believes in everlasting peace. I am the one Senator who upon this floor pointed out to every other Senator, at the time when the United Nations Charter was about to be voted for by the Senate, that those who spoke in favor of it—and I particularly mentioned the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, after he had said that the United Nations Charter we were about to vote for was similar to the Constitution of the United States—I, and I alone, on this floor, Mr. President, pointed out that, under our Constitution, when the Thirteen Colonies joined together, neither Vermont nor New York nor any other State had the power of veto over any of the other of the 13 Colonies. I pointed out that the veto power provided by the Charter of the United Nations was going to cause a great deal of trouble. I pointed out that in my opinion the Charter of the United Nations could not work, if one country had the veto power over all the actions of the other countries who signed the United Nations Charter.

Mr. President, it is indeed remarkable that within a comparatively few weeks after the United States signed the United Nations Charter, we find that in the newspapers for the past Sunday there appeared an article by the Secretary of the United Nations—and it appeared in newspapers all over America and, no doubt, all over the world—in which he said that in his opinion the United Nations Charter could not succeed unless the veto power were eliminated. However, there is no provision in the United Nations Charter for removing the veto power. There is no provision for amending the United Nations Charter, unless it is done by unanimous consent of every one of the countries who signed it.

Yet the American delegation and the British delegation at San Francisco put up no battle to get rid of the veto power, at the time when the United Nations Charter was being drafted. Nay, Mr. President, to the contrary, when one of the distinguished delegates to the San Francisco Conference—the representative of Australia—fought to have the small powers placed on a basis of equality with the larger powers, under the United Nations Charter, when the representative of Australia fought for the same thing that the smallest, tiniest colony of the Thirteen Colonies in America fought for at the time when our Constitution was being drawn up and adopted, the United States and England said, "No." Mr. President, when history is finally written the greatest statesmen among all the men who appeared at San Francisco will be found to be that brilliant statesman from Australia.

What are the important facts, figures, and testimony pertaining to the matter of draft extension? Let me say that I am delighted that the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is now in the Chamber, because in his speeches in the past he has time and time again verified the figures I shall cite. As I was about to say, the important facts and figures and testimony show that the Army can have more than 1,550,000 men by July 1 without the draft. If we pay enough for service in our armed forces, a sufficient number of young men will enter them. The very figures I have read prove that. But instead of giving the poor GI's who were drafted more than $50 a month—just think of it, Mr. President, $50—their brothers who did not go into the armed forces were permitted to make as much as they possibly could make. When an effort was made to limit salaries in the United States, Congress would not even pass the proposed measure, and Congress said to those who were not drafted, "Go ahead and make all you possibly can make." During the war there was a proposal that salaries be limited to $25,000 net, but the Congress refused to pass such a measure. It was proposed that salaries in the United States be limited to a gross amount of approximately $67,200, which would leave a net amount of not more than $25,000 after the payment of income taxes. But the Congress refused to enact such a measure. Oh, yes, Mr. President; the Congress showed what it thought of the sacrifices the GI's were making. In fact, one man in California, at the very time when the GI's were risking their lives in the fox holes, made approximately a million and a half dollars. It was said that he would lose much of it by way of payments to the Government under the income-tax law. It is significant that last year the Federal Government paid more than a billion dollars in income-tax refunds. The GI's will be glad to know that a man like the one I have just mentioned could even have, as a hobby—this man who made a million and a half dollars—the maintenance of a race track. If he wished to do so, he could pay $50,000 for a race horse and could race it—as a hobby—and could deduct that amount from his income tax, as an expense. That was the case at the very time when, upon this floor, it was alleged that Marshall Field was running various newspapers as a hobby, and that he could make income-tax deductions for the expenses of operating his newspapers—in short, that he could do as other men had done for a long time, and that it was perfectly legal to do so. Mr. President, I wonder what the GI's who were sacrificing their all thought about a Congress which refused to limit to a net of $25,000 a year the amount of money a man or a woman in the United States could make in salary alone, and when the Congress said, "That is too little; go ahead and make all you possibly can make."

Another important fact is that those who make the estimates of the number of volunteers do not consider the matter of pay increases. Mr. President, how can it be said that voluntary enlistments will decrease in May and June and July and August? As a matter of fact, they may increase.

The other House has already voted for pay increases. If the Senate votes to concur in the House action, and the pay is increased, thousands of boys may enlist who would not enlist under the present rate of compensation. So it is idle to say, as it was said by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, that we will not receive a sufficient number of voluntary enlistments.

One of the most important questions is, Are enlistments being retarded by raising the point system? I assert, Mr. President, that so many contradictory statements have been issued by the representatives of the War Department, and so much confusion exists with regard to the issues of military compulsion, that we must reanalyze the problem in its broader significance if we propose to solve it in a logical and rational manner. There is only one justification for approving the War Department's program of extending the draft act now, with its related recommendations, which would inflict a military system or a caste system upon the United States. I refer to national security. I repeat the statement. The only excuse for universal military training is the possibility of our national security being in danger. If we believe our security will be jeopardized by failure to accept the Army's recommendations, we must, however reluctantly, agree to the program in spite of its obvious dangers.

Mr. President, how often have we seen Senator after Senator arise in his place and say that he, though reluctantly, would vote for the bill to extend the draft act even though it did not meet with his approval? I maintain that no Senator should vote reluctantly for anything. I do not propose to vote reluctantly for anything. A thing is either right or it is wrong. If it is right, we should vote for it. If it is wrong, we should vote against it. To me, it does not make any sense to hear, as we heard today, a Senator say that he does not agree with the proposal before the Senate, but that he will vote reluctantly for it. I assert, in all sincerity and with full knowledge of the importance of the present issue to the people of the United States, that the Army's program for controlling the manpower of the Nation has no bearing on the security of the United States. If we do not extend the draft beyond May 15, we will be just as secure on May 16 as we are today. It is of vital importance that Congress, as well as the American people, understand that situation. Mr. President, allow me to explain.

If we will analyze the military policy of the United States, and the program of the Army under such policy, we will be compelled to admit that the Army has not been too brilliant in its approach to the problem of national security. If any disinterested person had sat in the conference of the Civil Service Committee the other day—we have now had about 13 or 14 meetings—and had heard the reports which were made by representatives of the Army, he would have agreed with the statement which was made that it was not possible to tell within 25 percent how many persons would be required by the Army during the next quarter. So I say that if we will analyze the military policy of the United States, and the program of the Army under that policy, we will have to admit that the Army has not been too brilliant in its approach to the problem of national security.

We have accused the Japanese of being copyists, and of not being able to originate any new ideas. I wonder if our Army has done much better? For generations our military leaders copied certain techniques of the Germans. No other country has had such influence on our Army leadership. Our officers attended German military schools. Some of them proudly commended the German panzer divisions during their maneuvers just before the outbreak of World War II. A great deal of the pattern of our uniforms, as well as much of our military discipline has been copied from the Germans. Our Army leaders studied German strategy and tactics which were considered superior to those of any other nation in the world. The military attaché of Germany was a welcome visitor at the office of the Assistant Chief of Staff and the G–2 office of our Army until the very moment of the German invasion of Belgium and France. Our military officers and our G–2 office, in their estimate of the military situation just before the German invasion, stated that Germany would not invade Belgium. The prediction was based upon the personal word of the German military attaché given to one of the subordinates in the G–2 office. Now, after the militarism of Germany, Italy, and Japan has been defeated and discarded during the terrible war, our Army goes off the deep end for militarism and aspires to becoming the leader in this new world.

The Army has consistently condemned the American people for their lack of preparedness during peacetime. I suggest that the Army look at the mote in its own eye before trying to cast out the beam in the eyes of our citizens.

Mr. President, we came out of World War I as the inheritor of the new revolutionary weapon, air power—a weapon as revolutionary in its way as the atomic bomb is now. We trained a nucleus of air force during World War I. We had every asset necessary to develop a new kind of military force, and to lead the world. At our colleges we had the finest body of young men of any country in the world. They would have taken to flying like ducks to water. We had an unlimited number of mechanics who could service airplanes. Nearly every boy knew how to drive a car and how to keep the motor in operation. We had an unlimited supply of gasoline for training purposes. Most countries of the world lacked an equal supply. In Gen. Billy Mitchell and his assistants we had inspired leaders who had a vision of the potentiality of air power. We had scientists who designed planes. We had a national industry capable of producing planes in unlimited numbers, just as we produced them later, but much too late. With all those assets we might, with the proper Army leadership, have developed the finest air power in the world. We could have built a fighting air force ready for instant action, an air power which neither Germany nor any other nation in the world would have dared to challenge.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may make a very brief statement?

Mr. LANGER. I yield with the understanding that I will have the floor at the conclusion of the Senator's statement.

Mr. WHITE. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a brief statement without prejudice to the rights of the Senator from North Dakota to hold the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, yesterday I reached an arrangement with the majority leader and those in charge of the labor bill to the effect that a recess would be taken at 3 o'clock this afternoon in order to permit the minority Members of the Senate to hold a conference on matters which they deemed to be of importance. In view of the situation which has developed, and in view of the great desire of at least most of the Members of the Senate to dispose of the pending motion, either affirmatively or by rejection, I have released the majority side from any obligations which may have existed with respect to the recess.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, what did the Army do with this potential power? It liquidated General Mitchell, and hamstrung his entire program. It shackled air power to the foot soldier, and placed its development at the whims of the foot soldier. It circumscribed instruction in air power in our service schools. It taught all the techniques of World War I all over again, when it should have had the vision to realize that another world war could not follow the pattern of the first. It spent as much money buying forage for horse cavalry in the National Guard, to permit officers to play polo and their wives to ride horseback without cost, as it did on air power in the National Guard.

I wish to repeat that. This Army which is now criticizing the Congress spent as much money buying forage for horse cavalry in the National Guard to permit officers to play polo and their wives to ride horseback without cost as it did on air power of the National Guard.

Just a few weeks ago, after a long generation of waste, it finally abolished the horse cavalry. While we neglected air power, Germany saw the potentialities of new weapons, used the techniques which we had rejected, and almost defeated us in World War II with our own weapons. So the Army, and not the people of the United States, fumbled our national security, and with almost fatal results. We may ask ourselves how many men had to die to pay for that blunder.

Now we come out of World War II with another revolutionary weapon, the atomic bomb. It is more revolutionary than air power. Every principle of military science which had previously been accepted became obsolete or suspect when the first atomic bomb fell on Hiroshima.

Has the Army profited by that lesson? Not at all. It sends its representatives before the Military Affairs Committees of Congress—and I have the record, Mr. President, right here in my hand—to advocate a program of compulsory military training, and an extension of the draft, in order to man armies which are as obsolete as the bow and arrow. Even the children in the street have ceased playing "cops and robbers" in their war games, and have turned to atomic weapons. But the Army has not learned that leason. It still speaks of bayonet training, and the .30 caliber rifle, and urges that training facilities for these weapons be not neglected. It takes proud credit for having, one generation too late, abolished the horse cavalry, and points to the fact that it has kept up to date by turning to tanks instead, but it is completely oblivious of the fact that the tank is as obsolete today as horse cavalry was after World War I. It proposes that we must drag the obsolete paraphernalia of mass armies along with us, as a ship drags its barnacles, until it finally awakens to the fact that these weapons, too, are obsolete.

These Army advocates state that we must have an army in being and immediately available, and conclude that this can be accomplished only with compulsory training and the draft. Obviously, the next war will not be fought with these weapons. We are all intelligent enough to realize that World War III, if it comes, will not follow the pattern of any other war. It will be fought with the atomic bomb, or with other new weapons of terror which are unknown at the present time—death rays, or death germs, or super V-bombs. It will be a short, sudden, devastating war. If we have not the time to train mass armies after war commences, as the Army rightly contends, neither will we have time to mobilize mass armies, or to retrain them in new techniques, or to transport them to any place in the world. The armies which our high command proposes to train have already been bypassed by the new weapons, just as Japanese foot soldiers were bypassed in China without having had an opportunity of firing a shot. We are still trying to transport those Japanese back to Japan.

The rigidity of the Army thinking on the problem of national security is as dangerous as the Maginot Line complex was to France. If we adopt its policy of basing national security on mass armies, we will pay stupendous sums to maintain obsolete forces, and will be purchasing a delusion of national security, instead of real security.

We do worse that that. We waste the youth of the United States. At the present time the Army has scraped the bottom of the barrel in selecting men for military service, and all that remain are the 18- and 19-year-old boys. These boys have no military value. They are totally unsuitable, because they are too immature, to be used as occupational troops. They are unsuitable for use in a technical army, as our new Army must be, because they have developed no techniques. We found during World War II that the more mature men were most valuable for our technical army, because they had developed techniques in college or in industry to fit them for their technical duties. If we now siphon off our young, immature boys, we will defeat our own purpose, and make them less valuable, potentially, for military service than if we left them in college or industry until they had developed the necessary techniques. The Army has no machinery for developing such techniques, as we dis-

covered during the war, when our young men, drafted into the military service, were sent to schools and colleges at Government expense to acquire the techniques which the Army was unprepared to give them.

Obviously, if there is another war it will be fought with new weapons and new techniques, which demand a minimum of manpower. We do not know at the present time how large an Army we would require, if it were built around the new weapons. The Army has no right to come before Congress and demand a blank check on our manpower until it has thought its way through the problem, and is prepared to give us some conclusive estimates.

In this connection I might say, speaking about 18- and 19-year-old boys and about selective service, this is what General Eisenhower testified before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs on April 8:

> There is no one that I know of, either in or out of the Army, that would rather have selective-service men than volunteers could he get all the volunteers.

That was General Eisenhower speaking, and I say that if we should raise the pay of the buck privates to such a point that they would receive the amount of money they should have gotten when the war broke out, we would have so many volunteers the Army could not use them all.

It has been stated that General MacArthur estimated that an army of 100,000 men, armed with the new weapons, would be sufficient. We do not know for certain what his estimate of the number is. We can take it for granted, however, that if General MacArthur were in favor of this system of military compulsion he would have been summoned by the War Department to appear before the committees of both Houses to state his views, or his views would at least have been obtained for the record. The very fact that General MacArthur was not summoned, that he did not give his testimony, is to me very significant, as I believe it must be to all the GI's everywhere in the United States of America.

Mr. President, it is not unreasonable to suppose that an army of two or three hundred thousand men would be sufficient. A tremendous number of atomic bombs can be carried and dumped by an air force of 400,000 men, which the Army proposes. Or perhaps we should have a small corps of saboteurs instead of men in uniform, because we may reasonably expect that the next war will be conducted largely by saboteurs.

The Army convicts itself of confused thinking in its own calculations of the number of men which it can obtain by voluntary enlistment even for the vast armies to which it has foolishly committed itself. When all of the shouting and the tumult dies we find, much to our surprise, that all the arguments revolve about a possible deficit or shortage of 70,000 men, based on a total estimated strength of 1,070,000 men as of July 1, 1947. It is a strange commentary on the Army General Staff calculations that civilians without any special background of military training were in the Senate committee hearings able to take the Army's own figures and show that the Army had omitted 50,000 Philippine Scouts and thousands of men drafted between January 1 and May 15, 1946, who will still be in service in 1947, 18 months later. Civilians and not the Army dug that fact out and presented it before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs during the hearings.

If Army figures are to be trusted it will have all the men it requires by that date. If it has not it can obtain them by other means within its own capabilities without calling for an extension of the draft. It can, for example, eliminate the caste system. Let it get rid of the caste system which the GI's hate and which has no place in the American Army. We cannot get rid of it too soon. Let the Army get rid of the caste system. Let the Army raise the pay and thus induce more general volunteering. I know the feelings of the distinguished Senator who now occupies the chair, the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR]. I listened to the magnificent radio speech he delivered in April of this year. I know that the Army of the United States would profit if it would call into consultation the distinguished Senator from the State of Idaho and listen to some of his splendid suggestions.

So I say, Mr. President, that if the Army wants to get more young men to volunteer let it get rid of the caste system. Let it give the GI the same terminal leave that it gives to the officer. Let it treat the GI more like a human being, and the Army will get all the volunteers it needs, and more, because, as I said before, all these arguments revolve about a possible deficit or shortage of 70,000 men.

The Army can bring back our soldiers stationed in countries which we do not need to occupy. There are fifty-some such countries, as I said a little while ago. What business have our soldiers in Iceland or in Korea or in some other country I mentioned earlier in my speech?

In addition to this, the Army can speed up the disposition of surplus property which our men are now guarding all over the world, or dump it in the ocean, since much of it will have so deteriorated in the Tropics as to be absolutely useless, indeed, most of it, so far as another war is concerned.

Mr. President, we have one hundred and some billion dollars' worth of surplus property. Until a few days ago the veteran did not even get enough of surplus property to wad a shotgun. The farmer did not get any of it. Every Senator on this floor knows that in the last 15 months or so we have had four different organizations handling surplus property, and that the thing was almost a hopeless mess. Besides that, as newspapers have stated, much of the surplus property was sold anyhow. We loaned Italy money to buy some of the surplus property. Italy bought much of it.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the Army can employ civilian guards both at home as well as in foreign countries to guard such property. Why should the Army draft a young lad 18 or 19 or 20 or a man 21 or 22 or 23 or 24 or 25 or 26 years of age and take him away from his wife and children, take him out of school, take him out of college, and send him over to Iceland or Korea or some other country to guard surplus property; to guard, for example, half a million cases of beer in Guam? I am in favor of pouring the beer out and letting those men come home. Or the Army can give away the beer or sell it if the Army wants to, or do anything it wants to with it so far as I am concerned. I do not want to be one Senator who votes to take our young boys from the United States and send them over to Guam to guard half a million cases of beer, or to guard whisky, or anything else along that line that the Army has over there. If the Army wants to guard that stuff, let the Army hire civilians and pay them enough to do it, instead of taking young boys into the Army to do such work.

In addition to that, our Army can get men from other countries where this stuff is located to do the guard duty. The Army does not have to take young men from America and send them to Iceland, for example, to guard anything over there. Mr. President, in my State of North Dakota there are two counties in which the majority of the people are of Icelandic extraction. We have had men of Icelandic extraction as chief justices of our Supreme Court. We have had them in the office of the attorney general. They have occupied the highest position of trust in the State. The people who came from Iceland have made splendid citizens, and I am perfectly willing to have the United States Army hire all the Icelandic boys they think necessary, or that they want to hire, and pay them well to guard beer or trucks or jeeps or anything else in Iceland or any other country rather than to take these 17-, 18-, 19-, 20-, 21-, 22-, 23-, 24-, 25-, or 26-year-old boys. Our Army can require the foreign countries to furnish the guards. Our Army can develop a military constabulary on a voluntary basis for guard and occupational duties. Primarily it can set its own house in order and make Army service such a desirable occupation that our men will be glad to enter the Army as a career. There is no reason why young men should not choose the Army as a career if we but pay them enough, if we give them the same terminal leave as officers are given, if we abolish the caste system and do away with the abominable distinction that now exists between GI's and officers.

Mr. President, I say it is a tragic commentary on our military system that with a million and a half trained soldiers presently unemployed, another one-half million taking training who will soon be looking for employment, and another million still to be discharged, the Army cannot induce a sufficient number of men to enlist notwithstanding it offers the largest labor outlet in the United States today. I say, Mr. President—and I believe the overwhelming number of GI's will agree with me—that something is definitely wrong with the

Army, and it is about time that the Congress made it its business to find out what the trouble is.

Since mass armies cannot be used for a foreign war, and since the atomic bomb cannot be used on the home front, is it not reasonable to assume that one reason for continuing mass armies is their potential value at home? During the depression the Army leadership was concerned with the military problem of putting down domestic insurrection. This situation arose because our leadership had failed at home and we were preparing to solve economic problems by military force, just as we try to solve international problems with military force. Whenever we find ourselves down an intellectual blind alley and cannot think out way out, we reach for our guns and try to shoot our way out, and often we end up by blowing out our own brains.

Does the Army have in mind a program of placing guns in the hands of our 18-year-old boys to suppress the veterans of this war, just as it planned to suppress the veterans of World War I who were selling apples on street corners even here in the city of Washington? Soldier boys were employed to shoot at the men who had offered their lives in defense of our country. I ask again, does the Army have in mind today the program of placing guns in the hands of our 18-year-old boys to suppress the veterans of this war, just as it planned to suppress the veterans of World War I who were selling apples on street corners? If we are realistic we will face this issue openly and not try to cover it up. Let the Army present an answer.

The point has been made that we require a large army as an instrument of power politics. If we actually intend to engage in power politics, backed up by military force, what value is possessed by large immobile, clumsy armies as instruments of foreign policy? If we commit ourselves to the same kind of army we have used in the past, we shall serve notice on every other country in the world that it will take us from 2 to 3 years to get ready for combat in the event of another war.

Too many officers in the Army are clamoring for war with Russia. I have talked with Army officer after Army officer who wants war with Russia. Let us remind them, if they cannot see the military situation themselves, that the United States cannot train and transport to Russia enough men organized into mass armies to defeat Russia on her home soil. At least, if we did it would be tremendously costly in human life. In my judgment we should likely be defeated, just as Napoleon and Hitler were defeated. Perhaps not. I am only a civilian. I am not one of the brass hats. Perhaps they have some system or plan worked out, about which the average Senator or Representative knows nothing. At least that is the conclusion of the Army and Navy men with whom I have talked; and I have talked with some of the best ones. Neither can Russia train and transport to the United States enough millions of men to defeat us on our own soil, for they likewise, I know, would be defeated. If we must fight Russia or any other power it must be with new weapons; and to place our reliance in the field of diplomacy on the mass armies advocated by the military is to jeopardize our very existence.

Let me suggest that the Russian people possess nothing that the American people want, and the American people possess nothing that the Russian people want. The quarrel is a quarrel between the leaders of the two countries. As for me, I am not as much afraid of what Russia may do to us as I am of what we are about to do to ourselves in this very prosperous country.

Let us take up a second significant point concerning the Army program. What is it that we have fought for in all the wars of our history? We believed—at least we were told—that we were fighting for human liberty. We were fighting in the first war to make the world safe for democracy. This time we were told that we were fighting for human liberty. In the Revolutionary War it was for independence; in the Civil War, emancipation. In World War I we were fighting to make the world safe for democracy; in World War II, for the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter These were all things of the human spirit, which we have added up to mean democracy. That is the only thing for which our boys would fight. They were not mercenary soldiers, and they would not fight for money. Those were the reasons given by our statesmen to cause them to fight.

It is true that between wars our soldiers were often cheated of the fruits of their victory, nevertheless the fight for democracy has continued relentlessly. We must now ask ourselves how the Army program of military compulsion will affect our democratic liberties.

Looking at the Army dispassionately for what it really is, it is clear to all of us that the Army is not a democratic institution. Its structure is fundamentally absolutist and totalitarian. It is highly centralized, with orders given from the top down. It is founded on implicit obedience to the will of the commander. Its leadership is ultra-conservative and reactionary. It has been isolated from the people of the United States for so many generations that it has little understanding of the point of view of the average civilian. Historically it has shown little concern for the views of the people.

Even in the hearings on this bill for an extension of the draft its higher staff officers have practically boycotted the meetings and have left only third-string staff officers to attend the meetings. I wish to repeat that for the benefit of every GI who was in this war. Even in the hearings on this bill for an extension of the draft—and I hold in my hand the record—the higher staff officers practically boycotted the meetings. As Al Smith used to say, "Let us look at the record." What do we find?

We do not find the testimony of MacArthur. Oh, no. We find that in these hearings on the bill for an extension of the draft, which determines the lives of literally millions of boys and girls, the higher staff officers of the Army have practically boycotted the hearings, and have left, not first-class men, but only third-string staff officers to attend the hearings, notwithstanding the fact that representatives of millions of our citizens testified in opposition—representatives of labor, the farmer, education, religion, veterans, and dozens of others, both in groups and individually.

The Army talks of democracy, but its leadership has little understanding of the inner meaning of democracy, and certainly has no machinery within its structure to carry democracy into practical effect. This totalitarian Army is stratified into classes, particularly between the officer class and the enlisted class. This caste system is a throwback to the middle ages, when the overlord could not stand on an equal footing, either officially or socially, with his vassals. We now observe the strange phenomenon of feudalism making its last stand in the military forces of a democratic America. How can we explain to the mother of two boys, one a lieutenant and the other a sergeant, that one is a gentleman by act of Congress and the other is not? One has the privilege of an officers' club and a well-managed officers' mess, and the other eats his food from a mess kit. One is not permitted to meet on the basis of fraternity with the other without risk of military discipline. I do not wish to be misconstrued as advocating any relaxation of military discipline or in favoring a complete leveling off of all men in the military service. Any organization, civilian as well as military, must have discipline. But I do protest with all the vigor at my command against caste distinctions by reason of artificial distinctions of rank. We are all aware of the fact that the first sergeant of an organization can fraternize with his men. Yet no one in the Army possesses a stronger position in respect to discipline than does the first sergeant. The same is true within the officer caste. The colonel and the lieutenant may fraternize at a cocktail party in the evening, but the next morning there is no question as to who gives the orders. If we can maintain discipline within each caste, we can obtain discipline even though we wipe out rigid class differentiations and permit fraternizing between American citizens.

Mr. President, this absolutist Army presents another question to democracy. Its system of justice is just as absolute and arbitrary as is the rest of its machinery. We are aware of the fact that the Secretary of War has appointed a civilian board of outstanding jurists to investigate the Army's system of justice. That investigation is long overdue. Stated bluntly, there is actually no system of justice in the Army, but, rather a system of discipline and punishment. Every phase of judicial action revolves about the commander. The commander may, and often does order charges preferred against a soldier. When so inclined, he may then select the most hard-boiled field officer to investigate the charges, and he may call in the investigating officer and make it clear to him that military discipline has fallen off in the command and that it would be quite in order to put the screws on the accused. Naturally, the investigating officer, in order to establish a record for efficiency for his commander, strives to

please. The accused is, therefore, prejudged before he goes to trial.

Mr. President, in my judgment there is not a Senator upon this floor who has not received, time and time again, letters from some GI who has been court martialed, or letters from his father or mother or some other relative, saying that the young man has not had a square deal; and, upon investigation by some of the very Senators who now are upon this floor, some of the sentences have been reduced.

The members of the court are aware that the commander considers the accused guilty. That fact makes all members of the court suspect of prejudice. The commander designates the composition of the court. He selects another hard-boiled officer as president of the court, and he backs him up with several experienced officers. He selects the best officer as prosecutor; and, too often, he selects an inexperienced officer as defense counsel. No enlisted man can sit on a court or be tried by a jury of enlisted men. Each man is reasonably sure, therefore, that the court will be prejudiced in part and inexperienced in part, and that his counsel will be inexperienced and under the domination of the president of the court. How can we expect abstract justice to emerge from such a situation?

I wish to make clear that I do not accuse all members of Army courts of being callous of the rights of the accused, because as good American citizens some of them do their best. What I do insist is that the system itself does not lend itself to the administration of justice.

After the trial the commander has another opportunity to inject himself into the situation. He must review the case for sufficiency of evidence to convict, only. He may reduce the sentence, but he cannot increase it. He may have called in the president of the court, in advance, and reminded him that it would be a good thing for discipline within the command if stiff sentences were imposed for certain offenses. When he reviews the case, if he is in a happy mood he may cut off a part of the sentence, but if he is in an ugly mood he may permit the entire sentence to stand. The level of punishment in that command may rise and fall like the tides of the ocean, according to the whim of the commander at a particular moment. The staff judge advocate who assisted the commander in reviewing the case has one client—his commander. The Judge Advocate of the Army, to whom the case finally is forwarded, has one client—the War Department. Neither is interested primarily in the GI. Neither is interested in the poor GI who may be away from home for the first time. Neither is interested primarily in abstract justice, but only in protecting the commander.

At last the victim ends up in the guardhouse. There we find our 18-year-old boy, or 19- or 20- or 21- or 22- or 23- or 24- or 25- or 26-year-old boy, who has gone absent without leave because of homesickness. There we find him placed behind the bars or forced to work about the reservation, guarded by another 18-year-old boy who carries a loaded gun. If the prisoner tries to run out on his guard, he is shot in the back—as happened recently at Fort Sheridan, where two such boys were filled full of buckshot when they tried to run out on a leaf-raking job.

I have discussed this point at length because of the effect of this military system upon our concept of democracy. I insist that if we place our 18-year-old boys in an establishment which is structurally absolutist in character, under leadership which has little understanding of the fundamental spirit of democracy, which has no techniques for carrying it into effect, which is reactionary in its outlook and has little belief in freedom of speech or freedom of press or freedom of assembly, which demands complete and unquestioning obedience of orders, which is split into two contending castes, and which has no true system of justice under law to protect the rights of the individual, we shall end up with less democracy, instead of more.

Mr. President, were we to continue the draft program during peacetime it is appalling to realize that in the Army's total system of military compulsion every American boy would eventually be conditioned to the Army's existing philosophies. We cannot permit that to take place without understanding very clearly that we will be headed for complete destruction of our American democracy.

Senators, allow me to discuss a third important point, namely, the influence of the military program on the morals of our youth. Again, I am not concerned with only the provisions for extending the draft but also the long-range determination of the Army to inflict compulsory military training upon us. We may be sure that if we now extend the Draft Act, next spring the Army will be back before us with its compulsory military training program, as well as with fresh demands for additional manpower to implement the training program. The point I wish to make applies equally to both phases of the situation.

The Army would like to make it appear that training in the Army develops our young men. It mentions dental work. Of course, that would be for men only, because girls are to be given no consideration under such a program. The Army conveniently forgets to remind us that it skims the cream of our young manhood and throws back upon society all those who most need proper health protection. The Army mentions courses of instruction in basic subjects for the illiterate. The Army spent thousands of dollars of the taxpayers money in preparing a brochure for the purpose of selling Congress on the value of military training.

Mr. President, allow me to remind Senators, if they need being reminded, that this is not a youth program. All the benefits to which I have referred, and which the Army intimates can be achieved through military training, merely emphasizes the fact that society has failed in some of its primary purposes. Every benefit which has been mentioned can be achieved more efficiently within the home surroundings if he will spend an amount of money in behalf of the girls of the country who are its future mothers, equal to the amount we are willing to spend for the boys.

Mr. President, at the time the joint resolution to give England $3,750,000,000 was before the Senate, I introduced certain bills. Some of them would have taken care of the very situation which the Army says it is now going to take care of by the proposed extension of the draft. I ask Senators to think of what would happen in this country if we were to give $3,750,000,000 to the States, as I suggested, for the purpose of protecting the health not only of the youth of those States, but of every man, woman, and child in America. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] explained on the floor of the Senate a few days ago what happened in Louisiana when three hospitals were erected in that State and it was made possible for any indigent man, woman, and child to go to those hospitals, free of charge, and remain for 1 day, 1 week, 1 month, 1 year, or even longer if necessary, in order to receive proper medical treatment. In Louisiana a person is not required to be entirely indigent if his doctor certifies that he is in need of medical care. Compare that fact, Mr. President, with the fact that hundreds of thousands of our boys were refused admission to the armed forces because they were illiterate or physically unfit. I do not need to tell Senators what was the nature of the test which was employed. As everyone knows, the test, or examination, was finally so trivial as to be almost laughable.

Mr. President, a few days ago I received a letter from Walcott, N. Dak. A man there was receiving an old-age pension of $40 a month. It was not sufficient for him to take care of his needs. He did some work on the side and, believe it or not, the Bureau of Internal Revenue charged him an income tax on his entire pension. When I telephoned to the Bureau of Internal Revenue I was told that I would be given an opinion as to whether a person can be required to pay an income tax on his old-age pension, but I have not as yet received the opinion.

In one of the bills which I introduced there was a requirement that farm-to-market roads be provided so that farmers could transport their products to market.

Mr. President, only yesterday I read upon this floor an article in Life magazine which insulted every farmer in America. The article stated that the farmers of America were so greedy that they preferred to keep their wheat on the farms even though in doing so it meant famine all over Europe. It will be remembered that I read the statement of William Plath, the president of the Farm Bureau of North Dakota. I also read the statement of Mr. John Kasper, State chairman of the production marketing Administration of North Dakota. The president of the Farm Bureau said that the wheat had not been delivered because of poor roads. Mr. President, a farmer may live 5 miles from an elevator and he may have a good road all the way from his farm to the elevator with the exception of one or two mudholes. If those mudholes were repaired he could drive his truck to the elevator and trans-

port perhaps a hundred bushels of wheat. However, as every farmer boy knows, one or two mudholes make it pretty hard for a truck to get through. So, if we had used within our own country the $3,750,000,000 which the Senate has already voted to give to England, one-half of which, according to my suggestion had been used to repair farm-to-market roads, the farmers would have been enabled to transport their grain to market and there would be no famine in Europe today.

Mr. President, one of the very men on the emergency relief organization, appointed by the President, is Tom Campbell, who comes from Harding, Mont., who is known as the wheat king of the world. What happened to Mr. Campbell? It will be remembered that a day or two or three or four after the 30-cent bonus was offered, Mr. Campbell said that he was getting tractors from some place or other, caterpillar tractors and other tractors, so that he could deliver 400,000 bushels of wheat to the elevators.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President——

Mr. TOBEY. Who has the floor, Mr. President, may I ask?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President——

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota refuses to yield.

Mr. LANGER. But Mr. Campbell could not deliver the 400,000 bushels of wheat in Montana to the elevator and get it to the market. Mr. Campbell, living out in the country, may have had a good road all the way to the place where the elevators were located, but unfortunately there likely were mud holes which he was unable to cross. If we had $3,750,000,000 we could fix up every mud hole in America on the roads, so that the farmers could get their products to the market.

Remember also, Mr. President, that there was a great deal of joking at one of the bills because it provided for a urinalysis. Yet some of the leading doctors of this country, including the members of the Rockefeller Foundation, have pleaded—they came to my State when I was Governor and sent men there to plead—to get enough money for making urinalyses, because it would save literally hundreds of thousands of lives all over the country. For the little expense of 2½ cents, three diseases can be detected. Yet, the majority leader said it was so important to give $3,750,000,000 to England—a loan, he called it—that he said he was perfectly willing to put aside the bill extending the draft until a joint resolution for a loan to England could be passed.

Mr. President, I maintain that the Army glosses over the fact that Army camps have not changed much in thousands of years. It was for that reason perhaps that the leaders of religion and the leaders in education came before the committees and protested.

I submit that the Army cannot be made to substitute for the home, the school, the church, and society in general in maintaining restraints on morality. The situation becomes worse now that the war is over, the men are idle, there is no excitement of war to keep up their standards, and their efforts appear little better than boondoggling. Unquestionably, a general deterioration in morale, followed by a deterioration in morality, is taking place throughout the Army. And now the Army proposes to fill all quotas from the only remaining source, the 18- and 19-year-old boys. We often speak of the boys who fought the war as the "lost generation." Now the Army proposes to make of each generation a "lost generation." We may be certain that all these boys, drawn out of their homes at too early an age, will require the same sort of reconditioning to fit them for a return to civilian life as is now required for the boys who fought the war. We will be wasting our youth, and wasting it to no purpose, if we subscribe blindly to this Army program.

Although 18- and 19-year-old boys are perhaps to be exempted now, the fact remains that in the testimony the Army indicated it wanted them, the Army said it would have to have them. The Army at that time was going to send them across the ocean and it was only when the religious leaders and leaders in education and farmers and laborers protested, when those brave, outstanding, courageous men appeared against the Army leaders and begged—it was only then, when the Army saw public opinion aroused, that the Army officials said, "Well, we will draft them, we will take the 18 and 19 year old boys, but we will not send them across. We will keep them here." Of course, they said at first, "We will send them across to take care of surplus goods, to take care of the jeeps and the trucks. We will send a part of them over to Guam to take care of half a million cases of beer. We will send some boys over there to take care of that."

Be it said to the everlasting credit of the religious and educational leaders of America that they were able to arouse public opinion to such an extent that in the House of Representatives an overwhelming majority said, "You have gone far enough, you brass hats of the Army. You are not going to take 17 and 18 year old boys."

That was a great day in America, Mr. President, when the religious and educational leaders could arouse the conscience of the people of America and formulate public opinion to such an extent.

So I say, Mr. President, Congress must face another practical problem if it passes this bill to extend the draft. Are we prepared to follow through with the necessary action to enforce it after we pass it? This bill is very unpopular throughout the country, and especially with the parents of 18-year-old boys. If they were convinced that the draft were necessary for reasons of national security, they would be willing to support the measure, but the Army has not, thus far, convinced them that national security is at stake. They do not want to give up their sons to guard property all over the world, or to end up in armies of occupation all over the world, with all of the demoralizing influences to which these boys will be subjected, or to permit their sons to be used as instruments of shabby international power politics. They were willing to sacrifice their sons for democracy, but are not willing to scarifice them for all of the oil wells in Iran or of the entire world. They have little faith in the integrity of the Army, for the Army broke faith with them before when it promised that their 18-year-old boys would be given a full year of conditioning to fit them for military duties, only to break its promise, with the result that boys were killed all over the world who had only a few weeks' training.

Mr. President, how well I remember the day when the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] rose on this floor to ask about a boy who was the son of a neighbor of his, who had been killed after only a few weeks of training, in violation of the promise which had been made by the War Department. How well I remember the alleged excuse. It was that he had voluntarily signed some kind of a paper waiving the months and months of training here, so that he could get to the front right away.

Mr. President, I and others, the religious and educational leaders, farmers and laborers, and businessmen see this program largely as another WPA, another boondoggling program for the unemployed. They remember that many of our ancestors ran away from their home in Europe in order to escape conscription, and wonder if our boys must now run away from their homes in order to escape conscription in the United States. They are not fooled by public polls, for many vote in such polls who have no sons to sacrifice, and only those who are directly concerned should have a right to vote. Too often the polls reveal nothing more than the effectiveness of deliberate propaganda of those who are determined on fastening this program of compulsion upon the United States. If we pass this measure, therefore, I predict that it cannot be enforced any more than prohibition was enforced. This draft measure deals with the American way of life, and with the lives of our future generations. If we pass it we must be prepared to strengthen the powers of the Department of Justice, to build more jails, and to set up more courts to try our young men who want no part of this un-American program of military compulsion.

At this point I cannot help but ask: What does the Army propose to accomplish by this program? What is its purpose? Why do Army officers lobby up and down the halls of Congress, on Army pay and at Government expense, to force this program on the American people? I have found no one except the Army and one or two other reactionary organizations that want this program. The Navy is only mildly interested—the Navy, I repeat, is only mildly interested, as it is doing all right on a voluntary basis. The Marine Corps is not at all interested. The Marine Corps does not want the draft. It is not interested in it. And the Navy is only mildly interested in it.

Why is the Army so interested in getting this program in spite of public opinion aroused by the religious and educational leaders of America?

Let me try to answer my own question. I believe that the answer goes as deep as

the American way of life. I have already pointed out that the extension of the draft cannot be justified in the slightest degree on the basis of national security. The Army has tried to blackmail Congress to put through this measure by threatening to hold on to the fathers still in the service. It has tried to frighten Congress by reiterating that if this measure is not passed we will be gambling with national security. I am convinced that instead of gambling with national security if we do not pass the measure, we will be gambling with the American way of life if we do pass it. One of the reasons we fought the Revolutionary War was because we detested the militarism which the British forced upon our early settlers. We came out of the war with an ingrained antagonism toward militarism, so much so that we were reluctant to have an Army even of 2,000 men. After the Revolutionary War we were reluctant to have even an Army of 2,000 men. That ingrained suspicion of militarism has become part of the American tradition, and has a part in making us willing to fight to destroy militarism abroad.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I am sorry, but I can not yield, Mr. President, to the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I wish I could.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. What a change has taken place since that time

After the Revolutionary War our Army was small and scattered. Our wars were small, chiefly with the Indians on our frontiers, and the Army was given a free reign in fighting them, since, except in the Civil War, the rest of the population was not too deeply concerned. World War I saw a marked change in the situation. We learned that warfare had become the business of the entire population, yet the military was given major control over the war. World War II carried that phase to its logical conclusion, for the war became a levy en masse with every man, woman, and child in the country directly concerned. Notwithstanding that fact, in the old accepted manner we turned the war over to the military. Every farmer in America, every businessman, every wife, the head of every household, every man who cannot get a shirt, every woman who cannot get nylon stockings, every man, woman or child who cannot get butter or bread—every one of them knows that Congress abdicated. Everyone knows that we turned the war over to the military. Congress, industry, labor, education, religion, and society as a whole abdicated their powers to the military because Americans said "We have got to win this war." The people were willing to do that, Mr. President, at that time, but the war has been over for a year, and I for one say that the Congress and industry and labor and education, religion, and society should no longer abdicate to the military.

During the war every path led to the Pentagon Building. Everyone took orders from the military, for the leaders of the armed forces held a monopoly on national security. Our Army leaders, conditioned to small tasks in a small Army in the piping times of peace, had little experience in handling the difficult problems of logistics of an entire Nation at war. It is true we did a splendid job, but through the efforts in many cases of our civilians in uniform.

Now the war is over, but the Army still insists that it holds the monopoly on national security. It maintains the fiction of a continuation of a national emergency, when no emergency exists any longer, in order to keep control over men already drafted. It accepts as a certainty the fiction that this emergency will continue for at least another year, for it counts on keeping all draftees in service for at least 18 months. It presented a program of compulsory military training which would give it control over all of the manpower of the Nation during at least one period. Its insistence on continuing the draft is but another phase of its control over manpower. It proposes to control the atomic bomb for military purposes. All of these proposals, if carried into effect, would give the Army tremendous power, in times of peace, over the entire national manpower and national economy.

On top of it all the Army is fighting for a merger of the three forces in the expectation, no doubt, that an Army leader will be the first to head up the new organization. Desirable as I think a merger might be from the standpoint of bringing about greater cooperation between the various forces, let us not forget that cooperation cannot be achieved merely by piling one bureau head on top of another bureau head. Confusion and compartmentalization already exist within each of the forces, in spite of the fact that each has its own head. Cooperation and understanding are achieved from the lower levels on up through to the top by training, sound organization, and actual experience.

The proposal for unification has this danger: One man might emerge at the top and be obeyed by the Army, under its indoctrination of unquestionable obedience, or one man in a military hierarchy might emerge and find it easy to negotiate with one man heading up the armed forces.

Militarism is a dangerous and ugly thing, whether it be German militarism, Japanese militarism, Russian militarism, or American militarism. Herein lies the greatest danger of the total Army program.

We are now the strongest militaristic nation in the world. We still have the most powerful army, in spite of the Army's program of demobilization through disintegration, for all the men demobilized are still in the reserve. We have the largest Navy and the largest air power. We have the atomic bomb, and we have shown the world that we have no hesitation to use it not only once but twice, and that after Japan had already been defeated. There was no military need to use it. The attitude of the Army on the atomic bomb has shown that we stand ready to use it again—and I might say "again, and again, and again."

We have a powerful industry to back up any military program we may wish to undertake. Our scientific achievements are unsurpassed. We have seized bases all over the world, pointed at the hearts of our former allies. Our international policy has been aggressive and almost endless. So today the United States emerges as a great military nation to be feared and distrusted by the peoples of the world. We inherit the tradition of Napoleon, Kaiser Wilhelm, Hitler, and Mussolini.

Again we come too late, for militarism died when the first atomic bomb was dropped at Hiroshima. Certainly militarism founded on mass armies came to an end with the development of the atomic bomb. Few military leaders in the United States or anywhere else in the world seem to have grasped that fact.

We are beginning to acquire a fatalistic feeling that we are living at the present time in a state of armed truce or armistice; that our soldiers, as suggested by Dr. Hutchins, of the University of Chicago, are merely home on furlough; and that world war may break out at any time. The only changes we anticipate have to do with a new alinement of powers when warfare is resumed.

If war starts all over again, what sort of a war will it be? Will it be a war of bayonets and 30-caliber rifles, tanks, landing barges, flame throwers, artillery, and all the implements of war which we have accumulated in such quantities? I realize that it will be a great temptation to our military leaders to commence where we left off, with all the techniques and equipments with which they are familiar, and which they have been trained to use. Herein lies our greatest danger, for the next war, if there is to be a next war—which Heaven forbid—will bear little resemblance to the wars of the past.

It may not be waged with men in uniform at all, but with scores of skilled saboteurs trained in the secret placement of weapons of terror. It will in all probability be a pushbutton war, in which the engines of terror are suddenly released at a given time and entire cities are blown up in a few seconds, or it may be waged with disease germs released to spread death and destruction throughout the Nation. If it is a war of men in uniform it may be fought in the stratosphere with atomic bombs carried high above the earth by super B-29's, or projected half-way around the earth as guided missiles, radio-guided planes, or super bombs; or we may develop a death ray, with which the Japs were successfully exprimenting before the end of the war. If they succeeded in killing rabbits at 300 feet, it will not be difficult to develop rays to kill men at 3,000 miles.

Such will be the weapons actually used. Every dollar that we spend on misnamed forces of security will be wasted. This is the reality which we must face.

And what is the ultimate reality? It is the inescapable fact that these weapons will certainly be developed; that no other kinds of weapons will be used. But if we use these weapons we destroy civilization. The mind of man has caused us to gain control over power so great as to

be beyond our comprehension. If we now use that power for human destruction, it will be a comparatively simple matter to destroy humanity. The tremendous potentialities of these weapons of terror automatically outlaw them for warfare, and automatically outlaw war itself. Universal disarmament and peace have now become the most urgent military necessity.

I repeat that, Mr. President. Universal disarmament and peace have now become the most urgent military necessity. No military commander will undertake a compaign which is doomed to failure. No military commander can develop or plan a campaign and present it to his superiors or to the President of the United States as a plan of campaign, and then state that the campaign must end in failure. Yet that is exactly the position in which all commanders find themselves today.

General Eisenhower might well report to the President at the present time that the only salvation of the United States for the future is the prevention of war through diplomatic means, because armies and armaments and military force have become completely useless to assure the security of the United States. Civilization is moving toward the precipice. It is moving forward in a thick fog and may plunge over the edge at any moment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I am sorry that I cannot yield to my friend the distinguished Senator from Utah, whom I love very much.

This cannot be an armistice, or peace between battles. The present moment must mark the end of warfare for all time if civilization is to survive. Whether we like it or not, and whether we are mentally prepared to meet the issue or not, solutions in world affairs cannot be found in military force. They must be found in human intelligence and in human understanding.

Mr. President, that is why I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate some of the hundreds of letters which I have received from my constituents in the State of North Dakota. For example, a little while ago I read a letter from the Secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association in Grand Forks, N. Dak., a young man who had served in five campaigns in this war, begging that we do not have universal military conscription. I wish to read that letter again so that the people of America may know what the youth of America is thinking, what those men who have put on the uniform are thinking. This young man wrote me on April 24 as follows:

> I am writing as one of your constituents to urge you to use all of your energies in opposition to military conscription. I served as an enlisted man through five campaigns in Europe during the past war and feel capable and obligated to express an opinion opposing military conscription.
>
> I share identical views with Senator GLEN H. TAYLOR, of Idaho, as expressed in his radio address over CBS on Saturday, April 20.
>
> I will be waiting with interest for the views which you express in opposition to military conscription.
>
> LEONARD H. ENGSTROM,
> *General Secretary.*

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter from the president of the North Dakota School of Forestry, one of the outstanding schools in the State of North Dakota. His letter is dated April 23. He says:

> I have been informed that S. 2057 is now before the Senate and that it includes the extension of the draft to 18- and 19-year-old boys.

It is true that under the provisions of the amendments which have been adopted by the House of Representatives there is now an attempt to exempt 18- and 19-year-old boys from the draft, but I call attention to the fact that Senator after Senator has risen upon this floor this afternoon and has said that he reluctantly acquiesces in the amendments; that he is opposed to this measure; that he might vote for it, but would do so reluctantly. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Army wanted the 18- and 19-year-old boys for 18 months more, and that it was only after the leaders of the religious groups and the educational groups and the farmers and the representatives of labor came before the committee and only after they aroused public opinion that the House of Representatives, sensing public opinion, adopted the two amendments. And you will remember, Mr. President, that only a few days ago our distinguished majority leader said he was in favor of extending the draft or allowing it to perish—he did not care which—but that England had to be taken care of first, and that we had to vote for the $3,750,000,000 for England, even though the draft did die.

Mr. President, in the letter to which I have just referred, Mr. C. N. Nelson, president of the North Dakota School of Forestry, a leading educator in North Dakota, and the president of that great school, says:

> Frankly, I cannot see that young men of that age would be as valuable for police duty in occupied territories as men who have reached greater maturity. I believe that you will agree with me in the statement that young men of 18 or 19 are particularly vulnerable to the vicious influences of military conscription.

Let me add that I do agree with him. I read further from his letter:

> If it looks as if this extension is going through, it would seem that any boy of this age who is a bona fide registrant at any institution of higher learning should be exempted. We must remember that we already have a 5-year lapse in the educational progress of our population. It will take years and years to "catch up." I do not believe we can afford to do so, particularly since most other countries allowed students in science to continue their education, even during the war.
>
> It would seem to me that an effective occupational policy, our foreign relations, and the national welfare demand that we consider this question in the light of its effect upon the future of our democracy. I am convinced that we have always paid more for the lack of education than what we have paid for education.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> C. N. NELSON,
> *President.*

I repeat that there we have the judgment of the great president of a great school in North Dakota—in fact, one of the great schools in the United States.

It is a well-established principle that unless positive evidence exists to the contrary, anyone who commits suicide is insane. If anyone has any doubt about that let him go to the teachers of philosophy in any of our large universities. The urge to survive is so powerful in the individual that only the mentally unbalanced destroy their own lives.

Today humanity is in that situation. It stands with a gun at its temples and it is about to pull the trigger. If it pulls the trigger it will be because we have suddenly gone insane. I cannot believe—I refuse to believe—that we have arrived at that unhappy state. I still have hope that we may draw back from the abyss and may save ourselves while yet there is time. Who dares to give the command, "Fire!" or to pull the trigger of the weapon pointed at our own head?

At this particular time, as never before in the history of the world, there is a crying need for leadership and for effective machinery to bring about a new world order. The United States has assumed a degree of leadership in setting up the United Nations, which, as I said 2 hours ago, is the only instrumentality in existence which may lead the way to universal peace. However, at a time when this very Senate had a chance to do away with the veto power in connection with the United Nations Organization it refused to do so. Yet today the secretary of the United Nations says the United Nations Organization cannot succeed—he said so in an article which was printed in last Sunday's newspapers—unless the veto power provision is eliminated from the Charter of the United Nations. Although the necessity for eliminating the veto power from the Charter of the UNO was brought to the attention of the Senate by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], yet the Senate did nothing about it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I am sorry that I cannot yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield.

Mr. President, when I read what the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire said upon that occasion I stated that he compared the United Nations Charter to the Constitution of the United States, and that, in my opinion, the Thirteen Colonies never would have joined in that Constitution if New York or Virginia or any other large State had had a veto power over the other States. But when I brought that matter to the attention of the Senate it availed for nothing.

Yet, Mr. President, today we find former Associate Justice Roberts of the Supreme Court, the man who did so much to make the Charter of the United Nations a reality, speaking in the State of Pennsylvania and arousing public opinion to the fact that the veto power must be abolished from the Charter of the United Nations if the United Nations Organization is to be a success.

So, Mr. President, it is at this particular time that our Army leaders have chosen to start the United States off as a

leader in a new militarism race under the fatal assumption that we have a head start in that race and can maintain that advantage. Our Army leaders turn away from the thought of war with Russia. Mr. President, we are always prone to underestimate the possibility of war, as we did in the case of the Japanese. Now we are underestimating the Russians. It would be as foolish as it would be dangerous to assume that Russia has no weapon, even now, to counter our own atomic bomb, or that within a year or two, most assuredly, Russia will have such weapons.

So, Mr. President, I repeat what I said earlier in the afternoon—namely, that the common people of the United States want no war with Russia, any more than the common people of Russia want a war with the United States of America. Today the mass armies which our military leaders propose to build have no reality in fighting a war. The program of compulsory military training, the continuation of the fiction of an emergency—when there is actually no emergency—in order to permit the Army to retain control over our soldiers, and, finally, this program to extend the draft so as to give the Army continued control over the youth of the Nation, have no value for military security. All that this program can accomplish is to inject ill will and suspicion at this great moment in history. When good will is required as never before, the Army demands a program of militarization of the United States which would destroy the very foundations of international understanding. We cannot have it both ways, Mr. President. Either we must support the United Nations Organizations or we must go in for militarization. We cannot have both. They are inconsistent with each other. Yet, our Army talks in one breath about our commitments to the United Nations and of the force which will be required to fulfill our obligations; and in the other breath it demands the largest military force in the world. It must have its tongue in its cheek when it presents such an inconsistent program.

I should like to know what is behind all this, Mr. President. Is it indeed a program which is desired by the Army? Do our military leaders indeed believe that their program will insure further the security of the United States? If they are sincere, however mistakenly, must we swallow their ideas, knowing that they are conditioned mentally to thinking in terms of war and destruction, and that they have no responsibility for the furtherance of peace? Have they deluded themselves? Has the wish been father to the thought that mass armies, calling for very high rank, promotion, and pay have an significance? Or is there someone or some influence behind the Army, needling it on, and using it as an instrument for selfish purposes? If so, who is it or what is it? The people of the United States do not want this program. The Congress does not want the program, because only a few hours ago Senator after Senator rose on this floor and said that he voted reluctantly for the program. The entire proposal goes counter to every instinct and every tradition of the American people. Are we to be bribed, frightened, or blackmailed into accepting militarization at a time when so many of our sons have already died to destroy militarism abroad? Are we to lose the fruits of our victory through the influence and the leadership of officers of the United States Army? I assert, Mr. President, that the mantle of militarization does not look becoming over the cadet grey of West Point. This is not the time to fasten militarization upon the United States. This is the time to re-analyze our entire military policy in the light of the total national situation and of the new weapons of destruction which are now at hand. This problem cannot be settled in a piece-meal manner such as the Army is trying to solve it. It must be considered in its entirety, and long-range solutions must be found which will lead to the new world order, which is the most desperate need of all the world at the present time.

Mr. President, I should like to suggest a course of action to achieve this much-needed objective. First of all, I recommend that we kill once and for all the proposal to extend the draft, and that we be prepared likewise to kill any proposal for compulsory military service which the Army may present at a later date. I recommend also that we give serious consideration, even now, to declaring an end to the spurious emergency which is being maintained by Executive fiction. I repeat, Mr. President, that months ago I introduced a bill declaring this war to be at an end, and yet that bill has not been given a hearing before any committee. Months ago I introduced a bill which would end the draft. Months ago I introduced a bill which provided that if some of the foreign countries were to be occupied continually, we use the manpower of some of our allies in occupying those countries.

Mr. President, how many boys from Mexico, how many boys from Brazil, how many boys from Argentina, how many boys from Uruguay or Ecuador, how many boys from any of our allied countries are being used in the occupied zones of Europe and Japan? Why should boys from North Dakota, from Michigan, from New York, from Illinois, and other States be used in the occupation of those zones? Why should not the boys of our allied countries be stationed in those zones, and in the same proportion as are the boys of the United States? So, Mr. President, months ago I introduced bills with regard to this entire subject.

Once again I want to make my record clear, and I want it to be available to every North Dakota boy so that he may read it and be informed. I want that record to be where every constituent in my State may look at it between now and election day, which is only 6 weeks away. Far be it from me, Mr. President, to hold my Senate seat by any cowardly act. I shall not sit here in silence because election day is only 6 weeks away. I believe that when the constituents of a Senator send him to the United States Senate he is sent there to vote his honest convictions, and that it is his duty to vote his convictions whether election day is 1 week, 4 weeks, 4 months, 4 years, or nearly 6 years away. It may be, as the CIO and the PAC have said, they will defeat me in my campaign for election in the State of North Dakota. They have boasted that they will do so. It has also been boasted that the Republican Party has under its control approximately $6,000,000 to use in the campaign if necessary. But I promise every Senator that when LANGER goes out of that door he will go out with his head up and with his conscience clear, knowing that he has represented honestly and to the best of his ability his constituents in his home State of North Dakota, and that he voted as he believes an overwhelming majority of the people of that State would have voted if they had had an opportunity to vote on the proposal now before the Senate.

Mr. President, while some of the Members of the Senate may not agree with me, I believe sincerely that we would be making a serious mistake if we were to agree to the motion which has been made by the distinguished Senator from Utah, for whom I have the highest regard and the greatest admiration.

I repeat, Mr. President, that I want to keep the record straight. Months ago I introduced a bill to have the war declared to be at an end. Months ago I introduced a bill declaring an end to the draft. When the war started I wanted the GI's to be given decent compensation; not $50 a month, but $100 a month. In that effort the distinguished former Senator from Missouri, Bennett Champ Clark, who was at one time the first national commander of the American Legion, backed me on this floor.

Mr. President, I believe that the Army has in its power means to establish such a military force as might be needed to protect our country during the years which lie ahead. Allow me to remind you, Mr. President, that when Germany was deprived of her mass armies following World War I she found means to increase her power by switching to new weapons so that she became stronger than ever before. We would be doing the Army a favor if we were to require it to modernize. By eliminating this useless program of military compulsion we would achieve an important psychological result in our international relationships. We would show the world that we are not the hypocrites which the program makes us out to be. We can take the lead in eliminating conscription all over the world. Such conscription will never be an effectual guaranty of peace since the nations do not now wish to maintain mass armies. The elimination of the program would help to bring about a better understanding between nations, and would lift the present terrible burden of taxation from the necks of all the peoples of the world. I say, Mr. President, that it is our duty to assume leadership in this direction. We should not, however, assume it by increasing, increasing, and increasing everlastingly greater armies, greater armies, larger armies and larger armies. Our primary problem in connection with the national security is psychological. Our little minds are unable to grasp the fact that we must not have any more world wars. We have become so used to wars

and rumors of wars that they have become a part of our environment. We cannot imagine a world in which wars do not take place. It will require time and education to convince our people of the realities of the situation. Very well; let us be realistic. Let us admit that the United States cannot abolish its own armies in this critical moment in the world's history until other nations do likewise, or until a new world order is established under the United Nations Organization. In this situation we cannot commit ourselves to obsolete mass armies, and thus serve notice on the world that it will take us two to three years to get ready for a war. If the Army were strictly honest with itself and with us, it would realize that it has no intention of committing itself to mass armies, for it has established special powerful units to develop the new weapons. It is holding onto the old weapons because of its own inertia, because it is incapable of the daring act of abolishing them now that they have become useless, and because of reasons of sentiment. It likes the old armies which have become familiar.

Again I want to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the Navy does not want this extension of the draft law, the Marines do not want it, only the Army is here begging and pleading for it. So I say, Mr. President, that we must build our armies about the new weapons. We must call in our top military leaders, who had experience in the new weapons, our scientists, our industrialists, and others who can contribute to the development of a really modern military force. Only after the basic factors have been established can the final problem of manpower be tackled. The Army has put the cart before the horse. It is crying for manpower before it knows the weapons which are to be served. Perhaps all that we shall need is a corps of saboteurs.

Any army that we organize is certain to be a technical army. It will be made up of scientists and technicians of all sorts. Some of the best minds of the country must be brought into the Army.

In such an organization there will be no place for a feudalistic caste system. The channels must be cleared for advancement from the bottom to the top. How unfair it is to have a young GI realize that he cannot advance, that he is held back by a caste system. Leaders at the top must be selected from individuals who have shown qualities of leadership and ability at lower levels. The barricade between an officer class and an enlisted class must be removed. Fraternization between citizen and citizen, between brother and brother, must be permitted if not encouraged.

The Army training system must be overhauled and correlated with training in industry and in our schools. During World War II the Army should have learned its lesson that it cannot train in new, highly specialized techniques, but must call upon other training facilities to help it do the job. That training program should be integrated in time of peace. It will be too late after war has started, if the war lasts only 24 to 48 hours, or at most a week or two.

Our Army must be justly administered. There can be no democracy in the United States if it is not founded on justice under law. The entire feudalistic judicial system of the Army must be completely revised to remove justice from the hands of the commander who, too often, used it as a club.

And very important, Mr. President, our technical army must be well paid. In that connection, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the debate in the House of Representatives yesterday. There was a very interesting debate on this particular question. Here were some men who within a few weeks have to face their constituents. They were told time and again that if they insisted on eliminating the 18- and 19-year-old boys, they would tie up the joint resolution, with the result that the legislation would not be enacted. I wish to read again what some of those great men said—and they are great, Mr. President. We have great men in the House of Representatives, men who are willing to sacrifice their positions because they believe they are right. I want to read what some of them said when they were debating this particular question on the floor of the House.

First, however, I wish to call attention to what some of my constituents in the State of North Dakota have had to say about this matter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I have here a letter from Alexandria, N. Dak., a town in the very western part of the State, from one of the outstanding women of that place. She says:

> DEAR SENATOR: Are we to be saddled with a never-to-get-rid-of military machine that will be our fate if the draft law is extended. Why the big army, we cannot afford it financially, nor can we afford to have our youth cast into the infernal machine as it is too corrupting. Our young lads thrown into such awful environment as military training is no more than a criminal institution where murder is being taught. A young man who was sent to Japan writes and tells of the houses of prostitution over there under Government supervision.
>
> What are we doing to our youth? I trust you are not in favor of extending the draft law beyond May 15 and I never saw anyone who favors it. Farm boys are still being drafted and they are not surplus. Returning soldiers are not interested in work, especially the youth, somehow their interests are not what they used to be.
>
> Food, food, yes, and still farmers are robbed of their help.
>
> Hoping you will help defeat the draft bill which is a military enslavement bill, I am,
>
> Respectfully yours.

I might say, Mr. President, that what this woman says about farm help is absolutely true. The selective service is in full force and effect in North Dakota. I know of a case where two sons have been killed in the war, and there is only one boy left. When the Selective Service sent notice to him, his father and mother wrote to me. The reply they got from the Selective Service in North Dakota is typical. When this father and mother said, "We need this boy upon the farm," they were told to go hire somebody.

I say to my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Utah, that it is absolutely impossible to hire help in North Dakota and the Northwest. That is as true in Montana and South Dakota as it is in North Dakota. When one goes to an employment agency and says he wants to hire someone, they say, "It is too bad, but there is no help available." I can show the distinguished Senator, not scores, not hundreds, but petitions and letters signed by thousands of constituents in my State who say that it is absolutely impossible to hire help, absolutely impossible to keep on doing the work, and if the Senator will go through North Dakota in an automobile I can show him farms which have been abandoned, where crops have not been put in, some of them within 4 or 5 miles of some pretty good-sized cities.

What every sane man desires today is peace. We are making an armed camp of the United States. It only builds a war economy, and compels other countries to do likewise. The result is an armament race, while money which should go for food and clothing is poured down the drain of defense, or offense, as the case may be.

This an atomic age, and there is no sense in building a wall of bristling guns and ships manned with uniformed tarzans when an atomic bomb could sail across the horizon and land a knock-out blow instantaneously, crushing the industrial factories that feed the war machine. Our Army would be but another Maginot Line.

In "One World or None," 15 scientists responsible for the atomic bomb and Gen. H. H. Arnold and Walter Lippmann explain in simple terms the stark challenge. There is no defense against the atomic bomb, and there is no secret about its manufacture. Here is their own summary:

> Atomic energy will bring death to the society that produced it if we do not adapt ourselves to it. * * * No program is sound unless it recognizes the special duties of the United States, unless it is built upon the principle that our insight and our patience must be greater than that of all the others. * * * There is not much time.

What we need today is a moral regeneration. General Eisenhower said recently that without it the world would go up in an atomic explosion.

In this atomic age the draft is as unrealistic as a straw hat is on a rainy day. In the first place, if we fear that some country is planning to attack us in the future, our best defense is our industrial strength, our scientific progress, and young Americans with initiative, self-reliance and with a gift of leadership. In the last war we learned that such men usually came from liberal arts schools and not schools which had gone over completely to military training.

In the second place, and more to the point, I believe we should think in terms of preventing war and not planning for it. We should strive for a more regeneration that would result in a sane foreign policy based on moral law, rather than

brute force, and in a liberal domestic policy dedicated to liberty and justice for all.

It is imperative that we reach a mutual understanding with all peoples everywhere, and not just a few million on the small island of Great Britain, whose good will we try to buy with $3,750,000,000. Good will can never be bought, just as the friendship of an individual can never be bought.

There are certain definite steps we can take. First, we must insist on world disarmament and world control of atomic energy in view of the fact we know that a nation like Russia can produce the atom bomb in a few years.

Second, we must stop building Russia into a Frankenstein. We certainly do not want war with her, so why do we not try to sit across the conference table from her and reach an agreement whereby this world can live in peace?

Third. We have got to insist on justice to minority groups, and stop the insane policy of trying to starve Germany into extinction. Unhappy and starving people are a fertile bed for revolution and another Hitler. Hate produces only more hate. We are in reality destroying this nation and the world. Yet, as Christians we have special duties to our less fortunate brethren, as is ably expressed by the 15 scientists who are frightened by the world-shaking bomb they have produced, when they said:

> No program is sound unless it recognizes the special duties of the United States, unless it is built upon the principle that our insight and our patience must be greater than that of all others.

The Government and the people of the United States have seen fit to place their hope of peace in the United Nations. How the same people can approve the draft and military conscription is inconceivable to me. It is admitting defeat. In effect it is saying, "We know the United Nations will not work, so we are preparing for the war that is sure to come." We have got to make the United Nations more than military allies among victor powers—a friend behind whom brute force stalks ominously.

Walter Lippmann said in an article on May 7 of this years:

> A duel is in progress between London and Moscow for the control of the German population, and its high military potential. As a result, the political reeducation of Germany about which we have heard so much, now consists of teaching the Germans that by exploiting the competition between Britain and Russia, making the two rivals bid against each other, they can recover the unity of Germany and make themselves the decisive military factor in European and world balance of power.
>
> We shall commit the greatest folly of all if, instead of exposing and denouncing this mad Anglo-Soviet contest, we let ourselves be sucked into it, blindly following the leadership of the blind.

The United Nations is being used by both England and Russia as the legal excuse for carrying on their own selfish desires, and each has its tentacles outstretched to grab whatever political and economic advantages they can.

By meekly adhering to the United Nations, we are indicating approval of their actions for, despite the words shouted angrily in the Security Council, I say that brute force stalks the world.

Indeed, Mr. President, I repeat that we must be prepared for the next step, a psychological readjustment, as I said, of our point of view. The Army we propose to create can never be used except at the risk of destruction of world civilization.

If we build our techniques around the new weapons, we must do so openly. We must publicize the effect of our weapons throughout the world by radio, press, motion pictures, and practical demonstrations. We shall have nothing to lose and much to gain by such publicity. If we arm openly, we will have the satisfaction of knowing and of showing to the rest of the world that competition in armaments with the new weapons of terror means competition for world suicide. If we conceal the effects of such armament, we conceal the truth from our own people as well as all the peoples of other countries, and may blunder into destruction through ignorance.

Mr. President, I would recommend that we announce to all the world that the army we are creating is to be held in trust for the United Nations, and is to be turned over to that Organization, in whole or in part, as soon as it is firmly established. When that time arrives we should be able to abolish all military force, except what we require to maintain internal order. Such an announcement would be evidence of good faith, would disarm suspicion, and would set an example for other nations to follow.

To supplement our armed forces at the international level, I would recommend that we establish, under the United Nations, international courts for the punishment of those who incite to war, just as domestically we punish those who incite to riot. We would not permit anyone to stand on the street corner and preach murder, yet we permit our columnists, our editors, our military leaders, to preach wars which will cause international catastrophe. It is high time that there should be summoned before the proper court the citizens of any nation who incite to war; they should be tried, and, if found guilty, punished in advance, and not after the event, when it is too late.

We must also break the monopoly over national security now held by our military leaders. Warfare has become a matter of concern to every person in the United States, and not only to a few military leaders in the Pentagon Building. As a matter of fact, the Army will be the safest place to be in the next war, as it will be under cover and widely scattered. It is our citizens and our cities who will be the victims hereafter. They have a right to participate in assuring their own security. I recommend, therefore, that we establish a national security council to stand above our military forces and be composed of Members of Congress and representatives of management, labor, science, education, farmers, religion, and other similar groups.

Congress has been asked to extend selective service for another year. I say that it is time for us to assume the attitude of a stern and righteous father who knows that only destruction can result if the two bullies in the family of nations become locked in mortal combat—destruction not only to Russia and England but to the United States as well, since we shall be sucked into the conflict.

At the same time, Mr. President, we must denounce the vicious Morgenthau plan, under which our Government is carrying out a program of exterminating 15,000,000 Germans and reducing the whole nation to a state not unlike that of the stone age. This murderous policy is not only unbecoming to a Christian people; it is sheer insanity. We not only create a deep well of hatred in Germany, but we upset the entire economy of Europe, since this is an interdependent world. When the exports and imports of a nation like Germany are cut off the rest of the world suffers with her.

Mr. President, I wish to read from a letter written by the economic adviser to the American Army in Germany, dated in March of this year:

> The greatest famine catastrophe of recent centuries is upon us now in central Europe. Our Government is letting down our military government in food deliveries promised, although what General Clay, General Draper, and General Hester asked for and were promised was the barest minimum for the survival of the people. We will be forced to reduce the rations from 1,550 to 1,000 calories a day.

Mr. President, we come now to the present situation in the Senate. I hold in my hand a pamphlet known as Capitol Gist, issued by the Capitol Gist Service and published at 100 C Street SE, Washington 3, D. C., to which I have for a long time subscribed. I find it to be a very good service, and that what it says usually is about right. I hold in my hand volume 9, No. 10, of Gist. It reads as follows:

ARMY WILL HAVE MORE THAN ITS 1,550,000 BY NEXT JULY, STATES REVERCOMB

Senator CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, of West Virginia. If the able Senator will add those figures he will find that on July 1 the Army will have more than its 1,550,000 men (figures referred to are totaled below):

Army strength goal for July 1, 1946, 1,550,000

Approximate enlistments (by July 1, 1946)	900,000
Officers	150,000
Philippine Scouts	50,000
Not in service a year	226,000
Draftees not in a year	400,000
Total	1,726,000

If we follow this to its conclusion, the draft could be ended on May 15 without affecting the proper discharge of men from the Army. (P. 3323, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 6.)

PAY INCREASE EFFECTS ON ENLISTMENTS NOT CONSIDERED IN ARMY ESTIMATES

Gen. Gordon E. Textor, Office of Chief of Staff, presented a personal survey to the Senate Military Affairs Committee estimating that should the draft be ended May 15 there would be no manpower deficits for the Army July 1, 1946, a 221,000 deficit on July 1, 1947, and a 336,000 deficit on July 1, 1948. (These estimates based on reducing terms of inductees from 24 to 18 months, thus hastening discharges.)

Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey. General, may I ask whether you included in your figures the so-called inducements for enlistment which we have discussed this morning, such as the higher pay?

General TEXTOR. I didn't include the prospective pay increase. I think increased pay would help a lot and we would get higher type men. (Pp. 174–176, Senate hearings.)

ARMY LOST TRACK OF 300,000 INDUCTEES IN 1944, TESTIFIES COLONEL CONKLING

Col. Roscoe Conkling, formerly with Selective Service, testifying before Senate Military Affairs Committee: "About April 8, 1944, someone decided to check up a bit and discovered they had lost track of 300,000 inducted men. They wanted General Hershey immediately to stop all inductions. The general had been crowding the local boards for weeks, 'scraping the bottom of the barrel,' and wouldn't do it." (P. 207, Senate hearings.)

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I regret that I cannot yield.

I continue reading from Gist:

ENLISTMENTS RETARDED BY RAISING ARMY ENTRANCE TESTS SAYS REVERCOMB

Senator REVERCOMB. A month ago the Army raised the passing grade in the Army general classification test from 59 to 70 * * * its effect has been that the number of volunteers accepted has dropped * * *. If competent to serve in time of actual war, certainly they are competent for a peacetime army. This action has a very direct bearing on the question of the extension of the draft, because if it can be shown that a volunteer army can be raised * * * there is no need to extend the draft. (P. 3305, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 6.) (Next page: General Paul says Army "eliminating professional private.")

What did General Eisenhower say? I challenge any Senator to dispute it. I continue to read from Gist:

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, testifying before Senate Military Affairs Committee, April 8:

"There is no one that I know of, either in or out of the Army, that would rather have selective-service men than volunteers could he get all the volunteers."

We maintain, Mr. President, that if the soldiers' pay is raised, if the caste system is taken out of the Army, if the men are given the same terminal leave as officers, we will have all the volunteers we need in this country. I well remember the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] agreeing with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. They believed that if those things were done, there would be very little difficulty in getting all the additional volunteers that we need.

Gist continues with the statement of General Eisenhower:

I can't tell any more than anyone else what this unknown factor of the 20 percent (proposed base pay increase) will make on our recruiting. I believe in it.

The 18-year-old man is not so suitable as an older man for a number of duties in the Army (including garrison duty).

Senator EDWIN JOHNSON of Colorado. We are a great Nation with 140,000,000 people strong and yet in order to get an army of 1,070,000 men on July 1, 1947, we have to resort to conscripting school boys.

General EISENHOWER. If there is some other way of raising this army—giving us an army of 3-year volunteers, sir, to do these jobs, you may be sure I will welcome it.

Senator JOHNSON. I want to thank you, General, for making that point clear. Some of the folks in the War Department seem to think it is their job to give us the details and lay down rules and formulas and go into the whole mass of ways and means of securing the army. The War Department's responsibility ends when they tell us their minimum needs and ours begins. It is our duty, it is our responsibility to the homes of America, to the 18-year-old youths of America, to the college and school boys of America, to see that we do not adopt a harsh method, a more harsh method than necessary.

Mr. President, never in the history of the Senate has there been a statesman who has spoken truer words.

I continue to read from Gist:

General EISENHOWER. If you can find a way of solving this without the 18-year-olds, I am for it.

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY of Wyoming. The thing to do is to improve the inducement for the voluntary enlistments and forget about taking the 18-year-old boys, first because they don't constitute very much and secondly because they are not good garrison soldiers.

Mr. President, nearly 4 years ago upon this very floor I advocated exactly what the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] asked for. The United States Senate would not grant it. It said that $50 a month was enough for a GI. The only other Senator who advocated it on the floor was the distinguished former Senator from the State of Missouri, Bennett Champ Clark, the first national commander of the American Legion.

I continue to read from Gist:

Senator CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, of West Virginia. Until a short time ago the passing mark was 59 (Army general classification test). It was raised about a month ago to 70. It was raised while we were in this program of taking in volunteers.

According to Gist, Maj. Gen. W. S. Paul, who was in charge of Army recruiting, said:

We were getting more of the low-grade men than we can use in the Army. Our small Army must be a highly capable Army. We are eliminating the professional private.

Then the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, and the very man who now is advocating that the Senate concur in the House amendment, said:

Comparative statistics are no good if you change any of the rules in regard to the statistics.

Statistics are kept for exact information so that we can read into the future, if possible. If, for example, the number is changed something like 10 percent, then it is improper to come and say there is a falling off in voluntary enlistments for March. We know that 10 percent falling off has come about as a result of your own action.

Those are the words of the distinguished Senator from Utah. I repeat, Mr. President, that 4 years ago, upon this very floor, time and time and time again, opportunity was given to the Senate to take steps to enable the GI's, the men who compose the fighting forces of America, to obtain some of the things which now are suddenly being offered to them in the hope of stimulating voluntary enlistments. Let me make the situation clear. Fifty dollars a month was paid to a boy who was down in the fox holes, to a boy who was risking his life, to a boy who did not know from one hour to the next—not even from one minute to the next—whether he was going to live, whether he was going to have the use of his arms or his limbs. But now, in peacetime, those who are in the Army are told, "We are going to give you more"—which is absolute proof of the correctness of the statement made on this floor by former Senator Bennett Clark, of Missouri, who said that $50 a month was not enough for the GI's to be paid. It is proof that Senator Clark, the former distinguished commander of the American Legion, knew just what the GI's were going to be up against.

Mr. President, at the committee hearings to which I have been referring, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] said that a pay raise "certainly will induce greater volunteering."

In reply, General Eisenhower said:

I don't see how it could help but do so.

Mr. President, the House of Representatives has already passed the joint resolution including the amendments, and now the Senate is asked to agree to the motion to concur in the House amendments. But if hereafter voluntary enlistments increase, it will not be necessary to extend the draft.

Mr. President, I have another matter which I wish to call to the attention of the Senate. Congress has been asked to extend Selective Service for another year, but the statements of those favoring draft extension reveal that, in the final analysis, the real goal is to draft the 'teen-age boys. Only General Eisenhower, of all our military leaders, has expressly stated that he would prefer to have older men than to have 18-year-old boys. He not only said that "for occupational duty in foreign lands I do not believe the 18-year-old boy is as good as the 25-year-old," but he said, "Frankly, if you can find a way of solving this without the 18-year-olds I am for it."

Mr. President, in my judgment the most serious aspect of the whole idea of draft extension is the drafting of young boys who should be at home and in school. There are at least five important reasons. There is a moral reason; there is a health reason; the draft will injure democracy; it will injure this Nation's educational and scientific status; it will injure this Nation in its foreign and diplomatic relations, thus endangering world peace.

The newspapers have been filled with accounts of the moral conditions in the Army—the black markets, the looting, the prostitution, and the riotous conduct even toward former allies. In order to meet this situation General McNarney instituted a program for combating "deterioration of discipline and morale among American troops in Europe." I quote from an Associated Press dispatch of April 25:

Admitting that both discipline and morale had declined seriously within the last few months, the European commander told a news conference he had issued orders that "prompt and corrective measures must be taken to remove the cause, deal swiftly and justly with the offenders, and prevent any future occurrences."

McNarney had cited as examples of weakened Army discipline black market sales, drunkenness, high automobile accident rate, general lack of smartness in appearance and

military courtesy, and an excessive venereal disease rate.

Mr. President, that is what was said by the general who was in charge over there, the man who knows the situation, the man who has been there and is there now. That is his analysis of this entire matter.

Mr. President, I do not speak for any other Senator upon this floor, but I feel that in the keeping of the Senate of the United States is the well-being, the happiness, and the health of all those who are the children of our neighbors and who are over there in the forces of occupation.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a minute?

Mr. LANGER. I am sorry I cannot yield at this time. I said when I began that I wished to conclude. I shall finish in a little while, if I possibly can do so.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator be through in a short time?

Mr. LANGER. I hope to do so.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator be through by 6 o'clock?

Mr. LANGER. Perhaps not; perhaps it will be 7 o'clock or later.

Mr. TOBEY. I have asked these questions because I wish to make some plans; that is all.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, when there is talk of drill-field exercises to combat promiscuity, venereal disease, and black-market activity, it is obvious that the root of the problem is being untouched. A New York Times correspondent, Raumond Daniell, understood this very well when he wrote for the New York Times of April 28 that:

> The restoration of discipline in the United States Army of Occupation in Germany, as ordered by Gen. Joseph T. McNary, European theater commander, will not be an easy task. Money, women, and liquor, in just about that order, are the chief preoccupation of too many soldiers for the situation to be cured by the imposition of a curfew regulation, close-order drill, and other similar measures, it is believed.
>
> Redeployment and agitation for ending the so-called caste system have contributed to the deterioration of the morale, but the trouble lies deeper than that. Basically, it springs from the lack of effective political indoctrination and a general feeling of utter futility among the soldiers, who too often have no conception of why they are here.

Mr. President, first we have the words of the general in charge of the occupation forces abroad, and, secondly, the words of the correspondent of the New York Times. I assert that it is important for every Senator to have in his mind a picture of the real situation into which boys are being placed before Senators vote in favor of the extension of the draft. We must keep in mind that these boys have been drafted out of homes and out of schools. Many of them have never before been away from home.

Mr. President, nearly 10 days ago, both the Senate and the House of Representatives passed a bill concerning this matter and sent it to the President for his signature. Up until last night he had not signed it. If he has signed it since, I have not been so informed. The bill provided that persons in North Dakota, Mexico, Kentucky, or any other State, who wished to send food to relatives in Germany would be permitted to do so.

The Congress also passed another bill, one relating to the postal situation, which has been lying for a long time on the President's desk for his signature. It has not been signed.

I represent many constituents who have relatives in Germany. They wished to know why they were not allowed to send to their relatives in Germany a little food so as to keep body and soul together, especially when the calories allowed to each person in that country have been reduced to 1,000 a day.

A few days ago there was some criticism of my remarks with regard to the British loan. I had talked in opposition to the loan, but certainly not so long as one other Senator who had spoken in its favor. It was so easy to say that some of us who were opposed to the loan had talked hours, hours, and hours, when, as a matter of fact, that was not true at all. I agreed to have the joint resolution providing for the extension of the draft come before the Senate. It was passed and sent to the other House. When it got there the Members of the House took, to some extent, an adverse view of the matter, having read, no doubt, newspapers and periodicals like the Christian Century, which portrays the deplorable conditions affecting our Army in Germany, or, perhaps, the Members of the House had been reading mail from home. Perhaps they had been receiving telegrams from persons who opposed the extension of the draft.

I have been told that the Chief of Army Chaplains, Maj. Gen. Luther D. Miller, in testifying on peacetime conscription before a House committee, said that he believed Army training and service would stimulate the religious life of the men of our Nation. I quote from his statement as reported in the July 2, 1945, issue of Newsweek. This is what Maj. Gen. Luther D. Miller said:

> As a parent and as a clergyman, I would oppose military training with all my heart if I thought it would destroy morals.

When a young corporal, Erwing W. Wadsworth, of Gulfport, Miss., saw this statement, he wrote a letter to Newsweek which appeared in their July 30 issue. He said:

> I wish to express complete disagreement with the contention of Maj. Gen. Luther D. Miller, chief of Army chaplains, "that, due to the religious program of our armed forces, more young men have attended church, read the Bible, and earnestly prayed than at any other time in the history of our country." Just the reverse is the case.
>
> Owing to the separation from his home, parents, wife, sweetheart, and friends, the average serviceman drinks more, swears harder, attends church less, and is more promiscuous than at any time previous to entering the armed forces. There is nothing whatever in the training program of impressionable youths in the service which would make them read the Bible, attend church, or earnestly engage in prayer. They are taught to hate and kill the enemy. There is no consolation to be found in religion to help them accomplish the things for which they are trained.

I might add, Mr. President, that that is not exactly true. Some months ago I had the great privilege of attending, with a great many other Senators, at Hotel 2400, a meeting presided over by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], one of the finest meetings of the Gideons I have ever attended. We have that organization in North Dakota, and they have done a remarkable job for the home life of this country.

I have here a pamphlet gotten out by Governor Philip La Follette, three times governor of the State of Wisconsin, one of the outstanding men in this country, who takes a position against peacetime conscription. I desire to read merely a part of what this distinguished statesman says. Philip La Follette, a veteran of World War I and a veteran of World War II, three times governor of the State of Wisconsin, says:

> I take my position against peacetime conscription as an individual, as an American citizens who has served in the Army in both world wars, briefly as a youth in World War I, more extensively as an adult in World War II.
>
> I am convinced that the conscription issue is one whose determination is bound to have an enduring impact on the peace of the world, the security of America, and the survival of our cherished democracy. I should like to make two points clear at the outset. In the first place, my argument, as will soon become clear, is directed against all versions of peacetime conscription, the new proposal by the American Legion no less than the original scheme of the War Department and President Truman.
>
> In the second place, I do not propose to deal in this article with what I regard as a synthetic, or artificial type of argument in behalf of peacetime conscription—the arguments, for instance, that universal military service will develop the health of our youth, indoctrinate our young men with a moral discipline, provide them with job training, strengthen their characters, or provide a substitute for full employment. Arguments of this kind, it seems to me, have been adequately dealt with by the educators, clergymen, Senators, and others who have already written on this subject for the Progressive.

Governor La Follette said further—and certainly his words are entitled to much credit, for he served in two wars:

> I approach the subject here exclusively as an issue of national defense—the defense of America from external aggression and the defense of our democracy from the internal assaults of those who are captivated by the short cut methods of alien ideologies and the total militarism of foreign totalitarianism.
>
> The invasion of an American's liberty by universal military service is justified only when it is unmistakably clear that the Nation's security demands it. Our national security does not now demand it. On the contrary, universal military service is now almost completely out of date and its adoption would almost certainly lull us into a false sense of security, just as the Maginot Line tricked the French into a complacency which proved their undoing 6 years ago.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. Not now; a little later.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder if the Senator can give me any information as to how much later.

Mr. LANGER. Sometime later, not so long.

Mr. President, one House amendment we are considering provides:

> (3) After May 14, 1946, no individual who has a child or children shall be inducted

without his consent for training and service under this act. As used in this paragraph the term "child" includes a child legally adopted, a stepchild, a foster child, and a person who is supported in good faith by the individual in a relationship similar to that of a parent and child but such term does not include any person 18 years of age or over unless such person is physically or mentally handicapped.

The second House amendment reads:

SEC. 3. So much of the first sentence of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, as precedes the first proviso is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of 20 and 30, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 20 after having been required to register pursuant to section 2 of this act, shall be liable for training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States."

Mr. President, the joint resolution as passed by the Senate provided as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 16 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "May 15, 1946" and inserting "July 1, 1946."

So, Mr. President, we come back to the proposition enunciated a short time ago.

Governor La Follette further said:

Most of us can agree that in time of war conscription is the fairest and most equitable way of sharing the risks and hardships of combat. In time of peace, however, the duties of the average soldier are comparable to those of any metropolitan policeman. There is no more reason to apply coercion to the recruitment of GI's than to policemen.

America needs a peacetime army, both for overseas duty and to provide a powerful, swift, mobile, highly trained, perfectly equipped force to defend us against any threat of aggression.

But we are talking here not of sheer numbers, or of size for the sake of size, but rather of a compact, highly specialized force of experts. We are talking here of a force of keen technicians thoroughly trained to master and keep abreast with the highly complicated instruments of modern warfare, rather than millions of conscripts rushed through a "quickie" course of calisthenics, close and extended order drill, and the other routines of a 1-year course under conscription.

Modern science is repealing many of the old laws of war which served so usefully in the past. The classical military injunctions have become obsolete in the age in which a single atomic bomb can pulverize an entire battlefield. Some of those old military concepts become perilous folly in an age in which a rocket plane streaking through the sky with the speed of sound can blast to bits a transport vessel ploughing through the seas with 10,000 conscript foot-soldiers.

Anyone who has looked with any imagination into the Pandora's box that military science has opened in recent years knows that the technical complexity of warfare will increase rather than diminish.

Governor La Follette offers a program of four points which he says is better than universal military conscription, and in the short time I have remaining, Mr. President, I wish to place the four points in the RECORD:

1. Establish a minimum pay scale starting at $100 a month, plus the usual allowances, for privates, with a corresponding increase in scale for noncommissioned officers.

2. Provide a system of promotions from the ranks and a program of education and in-service training to enable GI's to qualify for advancement and to become trained technicians.

3. Strike at the military caste system by narrowing the difference in clothes, quarters, mess, legal rights, and social life between GI's and officers.

4. Improve the officer class by putting appointments to West Point (and Annapolis) on a civil-service basis, and by putting peacetime promotions on a basis of competitive examinations.

So, Mr. President, although I have taken some 2½ or 3 hours, I feel that I have truly represented my constituents, as requested in the thousands of letters I have received. I have presented, I believe, in the 2½ hours the feelings of those who are opposed to universal military conscription at this particular time. I have presented it in my humble and feeble way, but as best I could.

I want to say to those who have asked me to yield, especially to the distinguished majority leader, who so many times has been very kind to me, that I thought I could save time and expedite the matter by presenting it as promptly and as rapidly as possible. I am very sorry if I have taken more time than perhaps some Senators thought I should have taken, but I did so on my conscience and as a matter of duty, feeling that in the hands of the Senate today rests the moral welfare of thousands and thousands of our neighbors' boys in all States, New York, Maine, Illinois, and Ohio and all other States and to the thousands who have written to me and protested against the extension of the draft I say that I have presented the matter in the best way of which I am capable.

Mr. President, I agree fully and entirely with what the House has done. The overwhelming vote in the House yesterday shows the influence of public opinion, as it has been expressed by religious organizations, by educational institutions, by businessmen, by farmers and laboring men all over America. If the measure is passed, I only hope that in passing it the Senate will make no mistake.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] to agree to the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate Joint Resolution 159. All those in favor will say "Aye."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Those opposed will say "No." The "ayes" have it, and the amendments are agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I asked for recognition before the Chair announced that the amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is mistaken. The Senator did not

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I was on my feet, and wanted to make a parliamentary inquiry before the Presiding Officer ever used the gavel and announced that the amendments had been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is a matter of judgment, the Chair will say to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show, inasmuch as the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has asked unanimous consent to consider the increased-pay bill, that I had agreed with some Members on this side that before the House amendments were concurred in I would either call for a quorum or summon them to the floor, because one of them wished to offer an amendment to the joint resolution.

I wish the RECORD to show that I was on my feet seeking recognition in order to protect other Senators, because they were not present, and that I did so in good faith. I also wish to reiterate that I feel that the present occupant of the chair [Mr. O'MAHONEY] announced the concurrence of the Senate in the House amendments at the time I was seeking recognition. Although I was on my feet, I was not recognized, and I feel that the rights of Senators who wished to be protected were foreclosed because of the action of the present occupant of the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1189. An act to provide for voluntary apprenticeship in the District of Columbia;

S. 1955. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide necessary utilities for veterans' housing furnished and erected by the National Housing Administrator; and

S. 1980. An act to continue in effect section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, relating to the exportation of certain commodities.

PROHIBITION OF PROSTITUTION IN THE VICINITY OF MILITARY AND NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, there is one more matter respecting which I ask the Senator from Florida to yield to me so that I can ask for Senate action. Tonight the act which prohibits prostitution in the military camps of the country will expire. The House has passed a bill dealing with the matter, and I am going to ask unanimous consent that the Senate may consider it and pass it, so that the law may not come to an end tonight.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, from the Committee on Military Affairs I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 6305) to make permanent the provisions of the act of July 11, 1941, prohibiting prostitution in the vicinity of military and naval establishments, and I submit a report (No. 1332) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and placed on the calendar.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 6305.

[PUBLIC LAW 379—79TH CONGRESS]

[CHAPTER 253—2D SESSION]

[S. J. Res. 159]

JOINT RESOLUTION

To extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until July 1, 1946.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 16 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "May 15, 1946" and inserting "July 1, 1946".

SEC. 2. Section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) After May 14, 1946, no individual who has a child or children shall be inducted without his consent for training and service under this Act. As used in this paragraph the term 'child' includes a child legally adopted, a stepchild, a foster child, and a person who is supported in good faith by the individual in a relationship similar to that of a parent and child but such term does not include any person eighteen years of age or over unless such person is physically or mentally handicapped."

SEC. 3. So much of the first sentence of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, as precedes the first proviso is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person residing in the United States, who is between the ages of twenty and thirty, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of twenty after having been required to register pursuant to section 2 of this Act, shall be liable for training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States."

Approved May 14, 1946, 8 P. M.